School of Theology at Claremont
1001 1350109

THE 100TH ANNIVERSARY
OF THE
HARVARD DIVINITY SCHOOL

1816-1916

The Library

SCHOOL OF THEOLOGY AT CLAREMONT

WEST FOOTHILL AT COLLEGE AVENUE
CLAREMONT, CALIFORNIA

BV
4070
H465
1916
Harvard University, Divinity School.

ADDRESSES

DELIVERED

AT THE OBSERVANCE OF THE
100TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE ESTABLISHMENT
OF THE HARVARD DIVINITY SCHOOL

CAMBRIDGE, MASSACHUSETTS
OCTOBER 5, 1916

Addresses...100th Anniversary

CAMBRIDGE
PUBLISHED BY HARVARD UNIVERSITY
1917

BV
4070
H465
1916

INTRODUCTORY NOTE

THE Alumni Association of the Harvard Divinity School appointed Thursday, October 5, 1916, for the commemoration of the one hundredth anniversary of the recognition of the Divinity School as a professional school, distinct from Harvard College. Instruction in theological studies was, indeed, given in the College from the time of its foundation, and for many years previous to 1816 students of divinity were registered as "resident graduates." But in that year the Society for the Promotion of Theological Education in Harvard University was formed to raise money for the further development of theological instruction in Cambridge, and in the records of the Corporation for October 18, 1816, occurs the first mention of "the theological seminary of the University." The Divinity Faculty was formally organized in 1819. The year 1816, therefore, marks the crystallization of the slow growth since the foundation in 1636, and the beginning of a new epoch in the history of theological education at Cambridge. Its significance was recognized by the early alumni of the Divinity School who observed the thirty-fifth and fiftieth anniversaries of the establishment of the School.

A committee of the alumni consisting of the following persons, Francis G. Peabody, '72, Pitt Dillingham, '76, Edward Hale, '86, W. W. Fenn, '87, Augustus M. Lord, '87, Henry Wilder Foote, '02, prepared the following program, which was happily carried out in every detail save that the numbers in attendance were too great to find admission to Divinity Chapel so that the afternoon meeting was transferred to the lecture room of the Semitic Museum.

PROGRAM

THURSDAY, OCTOBER 5, 1916

8.45 A.M. The University Service of Morning Prayer in Appleton Chapel will be conducted by Rev. Professor F. G. PEABODY, President of the Alumni Association of the Divinity School.

1.00 P.M. Luncheon at the house of Professor PEABODY, 13 Kirkland Street, Cambridge.

3.00 P.M. Meeting in Divinity Chapel.

Historical Address by Rev. ROBERT S. MORISON, Librarian Emeritus: "The First Half-Century of the Divinity School."

Address by President-Emeritus CHARLES W. ELIOT, "The Changes of a Century in Theological Education at Harvard."

5.00 P.M. Afternoon tea, served in the Common Room, Divinity Hall, by the ladies of the Faculty.

6.00 P.M. Vesper Service in Divinity Chapel, Dean FENN.

7.00 P.M. Dinner in the Harvard Union, Rev. Professor F. G. PEABODY presiding.

Dean FENN, representing the School.

Rev. HOWARD N. BROWN, representing the Society for Promoting Theological Education.

President FITCH, representing the Affiliated Theological Schools.

Principal D. J. FRASER, of the Presbyterian College of Montreal.

Dean H. L. CALHOUN, of the College of the Bible, Lexington, Ky.

President F. C. SOUTHWORTH, of Meadville Theological School.

Rev. M. O. SIMONS, of Cleveland, Ohio.

President LOWELL, representing the University.

ADDRESSES

THE afternoon meeting was called to order by Rev. Professor Francis Greenwood Peabody, D.D., President of the Alumni Association. The meeting was opened with prayer by Rev. Paul Revere Frothingham, D.D., '89. Afterwards the following addresses were read.

THE FIRST HALF CENTURY OF THE DIVINITY SCHOOL

BY REV. ROBERT S. MORISON
LIBRARIAN EMERITUS

"GRADUATES have always been educated for the ministry at Harvard College, and these together with their Instructors and the funds of the College appropriated to their use may be considered as having constituted a Theological Seminary. It was for the purpose of increasing those funds that the first subscription was solicited by the Corporation. . . . By the aid of these funds the Theological School now existing in the University was founded in the year 1816." These words written ninety years ago are taken from a report of a committee of the President and Fellows of Harvard College. They show on the one hand the continuous purpose of Harvard College for the training of ministers, and on the other that the development of this purpose reached a special epoch in the year 1816 which justifies the centennial celebration of to-day. From its first foundation theological studies had been prominent in the curriculum of the College; and the first endowed professorship was the Hollis Professorship of Theology.

It was therefore no innovation to have a course specially for Divinity Students. Indeed the innovation was rather in having a college course which did not include Theology, and Dean Everett said in connection with the origin of the Divinity School that it was not a question of the Divinity School separating from the College, but of the College separating from the Divinity School.

What was probably the first step in the differentiation of the Divinity School, or the Divinity Students, occurred in 1784. Professor Edward Wigglesworth the younger, Hollis Professor, asked for a change in the "plan for *private* Divinity Lectures, established at his induction." This plan had been for two lectures a week at the first of which he read "on *positive* or *controversial* Divinity"; the other being a "*catechetical* Exercise on the preceding Lecture." Upon this exercise attendance was required of "all the Students of the two Senior Classes," "whether Divinity, Law, Physic or Politics were the object of their future expectations." The catechetical exercise was not fitted for these miscellaneous students, so he wished to substitute for the second exercise one for which the theological part of Doddridge's Lectures was made the ground, and this second exercise, which was designated as the "Lecture on Thursdays," he proposed should be only for those students of the two senior classes who were "on the Foundations of Messrs. Thomas and Nathaniel Hollis, and Col. Fitch (whose benefactions are expressly appropriated to Students in Divinity)" and others who "voluntarily engage to make Theology their particular study." He also asked for a special privilege for these students in the use of books from the College Library, requesting that this privilege be extended to "the Bachelors, on Mr. Hopkins's or Madam Saltonstall's Foundations, or any other resident Graduates"

who might be studying "Divinity under his particular direction." The Corporation adopted the plan proposed by Professor Wigglesworth and the college students who were not intending to enter the ministry were excused from these theological exercises. This secession was on the part of the College.

This change was a very small matter, but it showed a new tendency. This tendency was not merely in separating the students of Divinity, it was equally true of those of Law and of Medicine. Although the College student had received a good deal of instruction in Theology it had been the custom that his special training for the ministry was received under the direction of a settled pastor. So the young student of medicine had been associated with a practicing physician and the law student read law in a lawyer's office. The students of all three of these learned professions now showed a desire to obtain their preparation largely from the University. Need of a professional school for students intending to enter the ministry was emphasized by the establishment of the Theological Seminary at Andover. This was established partly as a protest against the liberal theological position taken by Harvard College, and it became important that theological students who sympathized with the position of their Alma Mater should have an opportunity of attaining their theological education in a congenial atmosphere.

The administration of President Kirkland, from 1810 to 1828, included some of the most marked changes in the history of the College. During this period there was a decided increase in the number of students, in the number of buildings belonging to the College and in its endowment. When he became President there was in Cambridge a Medical School closely connected with the College, but

during his term of office the Medical School was formally established in Boston, a Law School largely independent of the College was established in Cambridge, and to a great extent through his personal interest the Divinity School was established; so that during his administration the College became a University.

The first important change in the theological education offered by the College occurred in the autumn of 1811. Indeed this change was so important that Professor Palfrey writing twenty-five years later regarded it as the beginning of the Divinity School. At that time Professor Ware as Hollis Professor began special exercises for the resident students in Divinity. In this he was assisted by President Kirkland in a few exercises in the department of Dogmatic Theology, and by Professor Willard in Hebrew. Professor Ware's course consisted in an exercise every Friday evening on Biblical Criticism, which was usually the consideration of a chapter in the Greek Testament. Every Sunday evening the Theological Students met President Kirkland for the discussion of some topic in Theology which had been "given out the previous Sunday for investigation and reflection." For this Doddridge's Lectures served as a text book, as it had under Professor Wigglesworth. The only other exercise in connection with this course occurred on Tuesday evening when there was a recitation in Hebrew with Mr. Willard.

To the theological funds of the Hollis Professorship already mentioned and the Hancock Professorship founded in 1764 was now added the Dexter Lectureship. It may be interesting to mention the source of this new lectureship. The Honorable Samuel Dexter after being prepared for Harvard College by his father Reverend Samuel Dexter of Dedham, showed so strong a disinclination to the pro-

fession of the ministry for which he had been intended that he entered upon a mercantile career and, having early acquired a competency, he retired from business; and though he had had considerable prominence in political matters just before the Revolution, declined all public office and for thirty years devoted his time to " reading, meditation and writing " especially on theological subjects, taking an earnest stand against the dogmas of Calvin. He died in 1810 leaving $5000 to Harvard University to promote " a critical knowledge of the Holy Scriptures."

The first appointment to this new lectureship was made in 1811. For the first two years appointments were made of Boston ministers, J. S. Buckminster and W. E. Channing, but apparently it was not until the appointment of Andrews Norton in 1813 that the Dexter Lecturer was asked to give time especially to students of Divinity. From him they now received instruction in the critical study of the Bible.

These three funds, the Hollis Professorship, the Hancock Professorship then held by Sidney Willard, and the Dexter Lectureship, were later regarded as belonging to the Divinity School, but at this time they were merely endowments of the College and the work of their incumbents for Divinity Students was incidental, informal and unsatisfactory. In the active, and in some respects radical, administration of President Kirkland, the need of special provision for students of Theology was not only felt but emphasized. In the autumn of 1815, apparently largely through the initiation of President Kirkland, steps were taken to raise funds for this purpose. A circular letter dated December 18, 1815, was sent out by the Corporation. This letter expresses the " need of funds for assisting meritorious Students in Divinity of limited means, to reside at

the University for a requisite time: — Of one or more Professors, whose attention may be exclusively given to this class of Students; and of a separate building." The Corporation was "disposed and determined" to apply the resources of the College to this object as far as other indispensable claims admitted, but these resources being entirely inadequate it made this appeal; and "as the best method of obtaining the assistance of the liberal and pious" it was "proposed to form a Society '*for the education of candidates for the ministry in Cambridge University.*'" Laymen subscribing $5.00 and clergymen $2.00 were to be annual members of the Society and a subscription of $100.00 constituted the donor a life member. The work of collecting money under this circular was entrusted to thirty-six different committees of three members each. These committees which consisted entirely of laymen included many prominent men. They were appointed under the names of the different counties of Massachusetts including three counties in the District of Maine. Apparently in some cases, especially in Suffolk county, a single committee represented a single church. It would be natural to suppose that the solicitation of funds would have been chiefly from the members of the liberal Congregational Churches. It was not, however, confined to them, and one of these committees printed the request of the Corporation in an appeal for funds addressed "to the Society worshipping at Trinity Church in Boston."

These one hundred eight men raised the sum of $27,300, and in the following summer, on July 17, 1816, a meeting of subscribers was held in the Boston Athenaeum and the proposed society was organized under the name of the Society for the Promotion of Theological Education in Harvard University, a long name which was frequently incorrectly quoted.

The officers of this society consisted of a President, three Vice Presidents, a Recording Secretary, a Corresponding Secretary, a Treasurer, a Vice Treasurer, nine Directors, five Trustees, and three Auditors of accounts. The board of Directors consisted of all these officers except the five Trustees. The five Trustees with the Corporation of Harvard College constituted a Board whose duties were "especially to assist young men of competent talents, pure morals, and piety, in preparing themselves for the Christian Ministry, and to provide for them the best instruction that the funds of the Society will admit." Then followed in the Constitution the words "it being understood, that every encouragement be given to the serious, impartial, and unbiassed investigation of Christian truth; and that no assent to the peculiarities of any denomination be required either of the Students, or Professors, or Instructors." These words have been often quoted as showing one of the basic principles of the School. They are not, however, the first statement of this principle. The following statement was made the year before in connection with the circular from the Corporation: "It ought to be particularly observed, that the consequence of enlarging the theological funds of the University will not be the communication of a sectarian character to that institution. The design is *not* to inculcate the peculiarities of any sect, but to place students of divinity under the most favorable circumstances for inquiring for themselves into the doctrines of revelation."

The money held by the Society was raised for the triple purpose of giving aid to theological students, providing for additional instruction and erecting a building. It was used chiefly for the first of these objects. Indeed with the appeal for this money, a statement was made explaining why students of theology need more pecuniary assist-

ance than those of law or medicine, which sounds very familiar now. No step apparently was taken at this time towards a Divinity building. There was, however, a reorganization of the theological instruction. Two instructors, one within and one without the College Faculty, were asked to coöperate in the instruction in what even at this time was called in the Corporation records "the Theological Seminary at the University." One of these was Mr. Andrews Norton, who was the Dexter lecturer. He was asked "to afford his assistance by attending occasionally a private lecture or exercise with one of the Classes in the Seminary on such branches of biblical criticism as the Committee on the plan of instruction shall find it desirable to commit to his superintendence," and the trustees of the Dexter fund were asked to consider giving him extra compensation or this purpose. The other instructor was Rev. Dr. Abiel Holmes, Minister of the First Parish in Cambridge, who was asked "to afford his co-operation by lectures and exercises . . . designed to assist the inquiries of the Students in ecclesiastical polity, and especially in the history and constitution of the Churches in New England." In view of the reasons that led Dr. Holmes later to leave his parish it may be interesting to note the words used in recording the vote for these two invitations: "It was desired of the President to signify to the Gentlemen invited to assist in the instruction of the Theological Students, the solicitous desire of the members of this Board that full effect may be given to that part of the Constitution of the Theological Seminary which has respect to the countenance to be given to the unbiassed inquiries of the pupils and the caution to be used in regard to inculcating a particular System upon the controverted points of Theology." Dr. Holmes seems to have fulfilled this desire of the Corpora-

tion, for, as Dean Fenn has shown, Jared Sparks wrote to a classmate in 1817, when attending his lectures, that, though his subject led him " almost perpetually to some Calvinistic tenet, yet he seems sedulously to avoid everything like party religion."

We have now reached the stage of development of which we are celebrating the centennial: the organization of a society for the sole object of the promotion of Theological education in Harvard University with funds to be used for this purpose, and instruction given especially for candidates for the ministry by members of the College Faculty, and by one person whose only connection with the University was the aid he gave in such instruction.

The new department was governed by a Board which consisted as we have seen, of the President and Fellows of Harvard College and the five Trustees of the Society for the Promotion of Theological Education in Harvard University. This Board held its first meeting in August, 1816. At this meeting there was presented a " general plan of the Theological Seminary " and the course of instruction, and at this meeting the Board voted that " the Corporation be desired to request any of the Professors and Tutors or Members of the Corporation or Board of Overseers, to aid in instruction of the Students admitted to the Institution. The President, as we have seen, had been giving instruction in dogmatic theology to students of Divinity. It does not appear that any other member of the governing Boards of the University complied with this request.

A word of caution ought to be added here in regard to attaching too much importance to this time as the decisive beginning of the Divinity School. The Quinquennial catalogue which recognizes no gradations between full graduates and those not connected with the University at

all, begins its list of Divinity alumni with the year 1817, as if the school had begun then by an act of special creation and not been evolved out of the nebula of hazy facts which we have been considering. The General Catalogue of the Divinity School makes the matter a little better by printing the names of students in lower case type for five years before the capitals are used for 1817 and later years, but here the capitals are too emphatic and imply more than they really mean. For the last forty-two years a student who received a degree of Bachelor of Divinity was a graduate, one who did not receive it was not a graduate. The line between them was very clear. For a good many years before 1875 the list of graduates was a definite one, though it did not come before the Corporation as did the lists of those who were candidates for degrees. In the early days of the School, however, this was not the case. It was not until 1851 that the graduates of the Divinity School were included in the triennial (predecessor of the quinquennial) catalogue of the University with the graduates of other departments who were holders of degrees. Apparently this list in the triennial was made in the following way. In 1844 Mr. J. L. Sibley, then Assistant Librarian in the College Library, published a list of the graduates of the Divinity School. There was no official list for him to use. He prepared it as best he could and probably did as well as could be expected under the circumstances. In the earlier years he could not find the year of graduation for men who had no proper graduation, and for this took the year of their approbation. He assumed the year 1817 as that of the first class, largely because in that year there were public exercises somewhat similar to those of the later annual visitation. This exhibition or examination, however, did not occur at the Commencement season,

but in the following December. In passing, however, we may say that whatever this exhibition may or may not have shown of a formal graduation it did show a formal school of Theology. Seven years later, in 1851, Mr. Sibley being then editor of the Triennial Catalogue introduced into it the graduates of the Divinity School, and as printer's copy for this took the printed list in his catalogue of 1844, merely transposing the names so that the surname should come last and latinizing the given names. So we must not look with too much reverence at this list, which has now become official, either as to the names it contains or the years, and especially the initial year, under which they are given. In one or two cases this old list has lately been altered by removing names from one year to another. There are still cases extending down even below 1840 where there is so much doubt that there is almost certainty that the names ought never to have been included in the Alumni list. When, however, a name has been included in an honored list for over sixty years, an unwritten law of limitations makes one hesitate to remove it even on evidence whose strength would be sufficient to change its position, or indeed to insert it if omitted.

In the year following the organization of the School, Levi Frisbie was appointed Alford Professor, and the curriculum of the new Seminary was increased by his instruction in Ethics; and in that year the Seminary was able to claim more of Prof. Ware's time, as the Corporation voted on August 11, 1817, "that in order to enable the Professor of Divinity to pay the requisite attention to the Theological Students, the instruction in Butler's Analogy be given by the Professor of Logick and Metaphysicks."

It may be of interest to note that in this same month the directors of the Theological Education Society fixed

upon Tuesday the day before Commencement "for the future anniversaries of the Society," this being the beginning of the Visitation day which for many years served as the Commencement day of the Divinity School.

The course of instruction designed to prepare students for the ministry continued in this informal way until 1819. The organization of the students was perhaps more definite than that of the instructors. The students were a definite body of college graduates. The instructors were for the most part a body of college instructors who gave additional courses in Theology. As an organized body they did not exist. The final step in the development of the School by which it became a distinct, but not at all an independent, organization occurred March 19, 1819, when the Corporation established "The Theological Department, or Faculty of Theology of the University," comprising the President and four professors, viz., the Hollis Professor, the Hancock Professor, a Professor of Sacred Literature, and a Professor of Pastoral Theology. The third of these, the Professor of Sacred Literature, was to be the Dexter Professor. On July 2 of that year the Alford Professor was added to the faculty. It may be mentioned here that this vote making the Alford Professor one of the Faculty has apparently never been rescinded. The first Alford Professor, Levi Frisbie, held his place in the Faculty for three years until his death. Then the Levitical succession was broken and his successor, Levi Hedge, who was appointed to this chair after it had been vacant five years, never had a seat in this Faculty, an honor which, however, was held for many years by his son.

We have now a definitely organized Divinity School with a Faculty consisting of the President and four professors, and with a body of students organized in classes. It

is true the votes of the Corporation named five professorships in the Faculty. The fifth, however, that of Pastoral Theology was not filled until ten years later. In a single year, 1820–21, Edward Everett, who was Eliot Professor of Greek Literature, is mentioned in the records of the Faculty as one of its members, there is, however, no formal vote of his appointment in the records of the Corporation. This was, perhaps, only for the first of the three terms of the year, when for the regular lecture once a week before the Middle Class on Jewish Antiquities and Mosaic Law were substituted " Lectures and Exercises in the Septuagint by Prof. Everett."

Too much emphasis must not be laid upon the establishment of a Divinity Faculty. We must not transfer to that period the important functions which have devolved upon the Faculties in later periods. Their time then was largely taken up with matters of the attendance and conduct of individual students; much of the work being of the kind later attended to by the Dean, or the Secretary, or neglected entirely, while matters involving broader questions of policy and plan were dealt with directly by the Corporation.

We have seen how approbation to preach was taken as a substitute for graduation in preparing an early list of graduates, so the substitute for the faculty's recommendation for a degree was due to a vote of the Boston Association of Congregational Ministers, a body entirely independent of the University, which required for " Students in Divinity, at the Theological Institution in Cambridge who shall offer themselves for approbation to this Association " a full certificate from the Faculty that they had completed their prescribed preparatory studies.

At this period in the School's development it showed itself considerably in advance of the times by granting a

travelling fellowship. A vote of the Board consisting of the Trustees of the Theological Education Society and the Corporation of the College, passed August 18, 1821, appropriated $400 for assistance of students, and contained these words: " that of this appropriation a sum not exceeding one hundred and fifty dollars be applied to the support of George Bancroft, A.M., pursuing studies abroad relating to theology." It was with this grant in his mind that Mr. Bancroft fifty years later established the Kirkland travelling fellowship, but without recognizing that the source of this grant was not the College but the Divinity School.

Much of the detailed labor of conducting the new seminary devolved upon the Corporation, as has been already shown. The Corporation did not enjoy this increase in its labors. Furthermore the hopes of the Theological Education Society had not been realized in either increased funds or increased interest. So by 1824 the question arose both in the Corporation and in the Society if it would not be for the advantage of the College and of the Divinity School to have a greater separation in the management of the two. The word " separation " was used in the records of the Corporation to describe the proposed change, but it was very far from a full separation that was either proposed or accomplished. It is true there were one or two members of the Theological Education Society who spoke of removing the School to Boston where it might be an independent institution. But the general feeling was distinctly in favor of retaining the connection with the University by which Divinity Students had the benefit of the Theological funds, Theological instruction, and library of the College. Moreover, it was felt that a complete separation would be a violation of the trust imposed in the college government by the contributors of the fund already

raised by the Society. After much discussion and a great deal of painstaking care a new constitution was adopted by the Society for the Promotion of Theological Education in Harvard University on November 17, 1824. This Constitution was promptly accepted by the governing boards of the College. Under it the officers of the Society were a President, a Secretary, a Treasurer, and five Trustees. These eight officers constituted the board of Directors. The Trustees of the Society and the Corporation formed a joint Board for appropriating money. The Directors of the Society were to "take the general oversight and superintendence of the Institution." These Directors were to report to both the Corporation and the Society. It was provided that the faculty "shall, under the direction of the Directors, oversee and administer the interior government of the Institution, and the discipline of the students."

We have seen that when the first proposal to raise money for the School was made in 1815 one of the objects was the erection of a building. The money then raised was more needed for other purposes, but the want of a building was still felt. On May 10, 1822, the Directors of the Theological Education Society appointed a Committee to solicit subscriptions for a building. This Committee a year and a half later reported that it had failed in its mission. Meanwhile the joint Board of the Trustees of the Society and the Corporation of the College discussed the matter at their meeting on August 15, 1822, and a year later appointed a committee on the building. There is still preserved a plan of a building which was perhaps due to the work of this committee. Unfortunately the last two figures of its date have been cut off in trimming the worn edges of the paper, but the water mark of the paper shows the date 1819. The plan bears the name of S.

Willard. This name without doubt is not that of Sidney Willard then a member of the Divinity Faculty, but of Solomon Willard a prominent Boston architect who designed Bunker Hill Monument, and many granite business buildings in Boston. This plan shows a very large building three hundred fifty feet long. The center portion, eighty feet wide and sixty feet deep, contained on the second story the chapel and the commons, the latter having a kitchen under it. This center portion was between two wings each one hundred thirty-five feet long and thirty-one feet deep and four stories high, each being an exact copy of Holworthy Hall in the arrangement of stairs, studies, bed rooms, and closets, but the study was designated a parlor and one of the bed rooms a study. Nothing further was done about a building in this year, but nearly two years later, in 1825, the matter came up again before the Directors of the Society and this time it was successfully carried through. There was a good deal of discussion as to the location of the building. Though several other places were considered, the choice really lay between land of the Dana estate on the hill east of the College yard, which could be bought for $500 an acre or apparently four acres for $1500, and the pasture in the " rear of the professors' houses," that is, " Professors' Row " on Kirkland Street, where six acres would cost $600. Though some persons felt that the Dana lot was well worth the $900 additional, the lower price, with possibly the larger amount of land, turned the scale in favor of the location which has now become endeared to us.

As I remember a conversation I once had with President James Walker, who at the time we are considering was a Director of the School, certain physicians were called in as experts to see if this site was so low and wet as to be un-

healthy, and it was only after they had reported favorably that the location was selected.

A little incident shows how the College regarded the independence of the Divinity School at this time. When the Directors of the Society were considering the question of the location of the new building, Judge White of Salem, who had been an active member of the Society from its formation in 1816 and was now one of the Directors, went to see President Kirkland to ask about the preference of the Corporation. President Kirkland declined to give any information, " observing with one of his bland smiles, 'it is our rule here for every tub to stand on its own bottom.' "

Meanwhile the Society was active in raising money. This was done largely through the churches. It collected about $19,000 and about the same amount was contributed by the Corporation from its Theological Trust Fund.

A plan for the proposed building was prepared by Thomas W. Sumner. A plan is still preserved which evidently formed the basis of the final one. It shows the building much as it was constructed, but with two large wings extending sixty-two and one-half feet to the east, one at the north end and the other at the south, making a horse-shoe shaped building, and at both sides of the front were piazzas seven feet wide making them even with the projecting center. This plan bears the date March 11, 1825. On March 24 Mr. Samuel A. Eliot was " authorized " by the Directors " to engage Mr. Sumner as the architect to superintend the erection of the proposed building; and obtain from him a new plan of said building drawn according to the suggested improvements." And on March 31, Mr. Stephen Higginson and Mr. Samuel A. Eliot were appointed a Building Committee. The building as con-

structed was much as it is to-day. The central portion on the west side of the entry on the lower floor, now occupied by the Common Room, was originally rooms used for the library and also for lectures. As originally built, the axis of the chapel ran east and west, but before it had been occupied five years the position of the pulpit was changed from the west side to the north end. The two symmetrical doors still show a little of the original design. The name of the architect in spite of the signal success he achieved in this building is now little known. The mason who erected the building bore a name which is more familiar — that of Noah Porter.

The corner stone of the building was laid July 6, 1825, with appropriate ceremonies. The money raised at this time, as was the case with the previous subscription nine years before, came almost entirely from Unitarians, and from these especially in Boston and Salem. There seems to have been a question as to who should be included in the invitations to the corner stone laying. The conclusion was reached that in Boston the " Calvinistic clergy and Baptists " should be included and that in Salem a representative of the Society was to exercise his own judgment.

After the laying of the corner stone, the construction of the building did not progress quite smoothly and " direful complaints " were made against the architect. The building was completed the following year and dedicated August 29, with a service which was made memorable by the sermon of Dr. Channing.

One of the many ways in which the Divinity School has been in advance of other departments of the University to be later followed by them is in furnishing a dormitory. But while in furnishing Divinity Hall in 1826 it was far ahead of other departments here it was not ahead of other

seminaries as the following item in the account of the cost of the Hall witnesses: "Expenses to Andover to get the Inventory and Cost of Furniture in Bartlett (sic) Hall — $6.00."

During this period of the history of the School and especially in the raising of funds and in the construction of Divinity Hall, the School owed a great deal to the interest and zeal of Stephen Higginson, Jr., who was at this time Steward of the College, a title since changed to Bursar. He was one of the committee under whom the building was constructed. As a Trustee of the Society, he was a Director of the School, and the only person who held this office for the six years that the School was under this Board of Directors. His portrait very properly hangs in the Library building. His interest in the School led him to give his attention to many small details. His son, Thomas Wentworth Higginson, was fond of telling a story to show how his father's interest in the School exceeded his theological training. He said that the binder of the Hebrew Bibles which he had ordered for the library to be used as text books had with each volume made the mistake of putting the title page at the end.

About the time that work was begun on Divinity Hall, the joint Board of the Trustees of the Theological Education Society and the Corporation of the College appropriated $2000 to be expended by the Directors for books for the Theological Institution, and voted that a further sum of $120 should be appropriated annually. This was the beginning of our library. The library, however, did not long remain in the quarters provided for it in Divinity Hall, for on August 25th, 1831, the Corporation voted that it be removed to Harvard Hall, where the College Library then was, and placed in the custody of the College Librarian.

This caused much remonstrance, and after eight years, while the new Gore Hall was in process of construction and two years before the College Library was moved into it, the books were restored to Divinity Hall to remain there until the Divinity Library building was completed in 1887.

During the time we have been considering, the Society for the Promotion of Theological Education in Harvard University was merely a voluntary association. When it raised money for the purchase of land and erection of a building, it was in the expectation and with the understanding that it would be incorporated, and so be able to hold real property. At the time of the reorganization of the Society, at the close of 1824, its incorporation was not pressed on account of the excitement connected with the incorporation of Amherst College. In 1826 an act of incorporation was obtained which, however, was dependent upon the approval of the Corporation. About this time there arose considerable friction and personal feeling between the Corporation and the Directors of the Society, and the Corporation refused to give its approval to the incorporation of the Society. It so happened that the land which the Society was buying for the School belonged to the College, and on September 28, 1825, the Corporation authorized the President to execute a deed conveying this property. The conveyance could not be made until the Society was incorporated, and the President and Fellows blocked the incorporation.

The chief reason for the objection of the Corporation was that the new constitution gave the Directors of the Society too much power in the matter of appointment of instructors, which they were said to have exercised in appointing a professor. The Directors denied this saying they had

sounded Dr. Channing to see if he would accept an appointment as " Teacher of the Pastoral Duties " if it were tendered him, feeling that the prospect of his acceptance would be a great help in raising funds. He had replied that he could not accept it. Perhaps a more marked assumption of authority by the Directors was granting the request for leave of absence of Professor Norton, who then merely notified the Corporation of his intended departure. While the Society did not wish to alter the Constitution, it did pass a vote expressing its opinion that the Constitution did not give it " authority to appoint Professors or Teachers." The Corporation did not relent, and the Society did not then or ever later take title to the property.

The direct control of the Divinity School by the Directors of the Theological Education Society did not accomplish what was hoped from it. It continued for six years until the latter part of 1830. On November 11, 1830, the Corporation adopted new statutes for the Divinity School. Under these statutes the duties which had devolved upon the Directors were for the most part transferred to the Faculty. The intimate connection of the Society with the management of the School now came to an end. The Society assented to the new statutes but decided that, although its old responsibilities had ceased, it yet " believed that the interest of pure religion and the promotion of a liberal study of the Scriptures, the object for which this association was originally formed, may still be essentially aided by the existence of a society, whose purpose it shall be to procure from the publick a generous patronage of these objects." It therefore adopted a new constitution which was fitted for the new conditions. On November 18 the Society voted to transfer its property to the Corporation, the transfer actually taking place on December 13. Six

months later the Society was incorporated with the simpler name of The Society for Promoting Theological Education. From this time on the Society has had no direct part in the government of the School, but it has continued to exist for the sole object of helping the School. For many years its representatives were present at the annual examination and visitation. In 1840 it raised $10,000 for the school. Since 1848, through the devise of John Davis Williams, it has held in trust about half of the School's beneficiary funds. In 1858 it raised funds for the salary of the professors of Ecclesiastical History, and of Dogmatic Theology. In 1885 it appropriated $7633.25 and raised $24,384.30 for the new library building, leaving but $5000.00 to be paid by the Corporation. In 1858 its basis of membership was changed from a pecuniary one to the present one of election.

For more than twenty years the course of the School now runs on in its new channel with little outside disturbance. The chief events of interest now are due to the changes in the Faculty.

We saw that when the Faculty was first organized, provision was made that it should contain a Professor of Practical Theology. Though the need was then recognized, the professorship itself stood in abeyance for ten years. Then subscriptions were taken for a professorship of pulpit eloquence and pastoral care. There was no attempt made to endow such a professorship. The object was merely to raise money for the necessary salary for ten years. There was so raised $13,180, of which about $6000 was payable at once, and the remainder during the period of ten years. Henry Ware, Jr., was elected to this professorship, and on the recommendation of the Directors of the Theological Education Society, he was granted a leave of absence for a year in Europe, on account of his health.

He began his work in 1830, holding this professorship for the ten years, and then for two years the Parkman Professorship, which in 1840 became available. In spite of the hindrances due to ill health, no one else in the first half century of the School exercised so strong an influence upon the lives of the students, or attracted them as he did, by both precept and example.

The new statutes provided for a Dean of the School and Professor J. G. Palfrey who had been pastor of the Church in Brattle Square, Boston, and at the same time for two years an instructor in the School, was appointed Dexter Professor of Biblical Literature, succeeding Prof. Andrews Norton, and at the same time, the first Dean. A vote passed by the Corporation seven months after this appointment shows the respect felt toward the elder Henry Ware. It provided that Dr. Ware was to preside at the meetings of the Divinity Faculty in the absence of the President, so long as he was Hollis Professor, "but whenever that connexion shall cease, the Dean of the Faculty shall forever after in the absence of the President, be deemed such presiding officer." Dr. Palfrey held the office of Dean for the nine years that he was professor. No successor was appointed and the position was vacant until new statutes were adopted in 1870. During this interval when there was need of recognizing some one instructor as primus inter pares it was the senior professor.

Though there were five members of the Faculty in 1830 at the time of the reorganization, this number gradually became less. Professor Follen, the German political exile, resigned in 1831. His position in the University, and especially his connection with the Divinity School, was largely due to his own personality, and his place was not filled. Professor Palfrey resigned the Dexter Professorship

in 1839, and this professorship was united with the Hancock. Henry Ware, Sr., resigned in 1840, and the Hollis Professorship was vacant for over forty years. By the autumn of 1840, the only instructors in the Faculty were the Parkman Professor, Henry Ware, Jr., and the Hancock Professor, George R. Noyes. But by this time the Divinity School had become well separated from the College and these two professors gave no instruction to any undergraduates. It should be added, however, that the Divinity Professors conducted the daily services in the college chapel until the establishment of the Plummer Professorship in 1855. In 1842, Henry Ware, Jr., was succeeded by Converse Francis, and from 1842 to 1863, Dr. Noyes and Dr. Francis were the only resident professors. Within this period, in 1847 and in 1848, several ministerial associations offered to provide lectures to supplement the work of the Faculty, but apparently none of these offers were accepted. About ten years later, in 1857, there were established through funds procured by the Society for Promoting Theological Education, as has been mentioned, two non-resident professorships, one of Systematic Theology held for six years by Dr. George E. Ellis, and the other of Ecclesiastical History, held for nineteen years by Dr. Frederic H. Hedge. Mention ought to be made of an informal course of lectures delivered by James Freeman Clarke in 1854 on "subjects connected with the religions of the East," for this course probably antedated any other on the subject of the history of religion in any university in this country or in Europe. In 1867 he was appointed a non-resident Professor and lectured regularly on this subject. In spite of the smallness of the Faculty during this period the list of men who were trained by it is a long and honorable one. Dr. Francis died in 1863, and

was succeeded by Dr. Oliver Stearns. Dr. Noyes died in 1868, and was succeeded by Rev. Edward J. Young.

The question of the separation of the Divinity School from the College which had arisen in 1824 had never been quite dormant. It came up again about twenty-seven years later, and this time a complete separation was proposed. With the close relation which existed between the College and the State, especially through the Board of Overseers which was largely elected by the Legislature, it was felt that there was too close a connection between the State and a theological, perhaps even a sectarian, institution, and on March 27, 1852, the Corporation voted to take legal proceedings to carry into effect a vote of the Board of Overseers asking for the complete separation of the School. This came before the Supreme Court at the March term three years later in 1855, and was decided adversely. Three years after this, in 1858, the Legislature passed an enabling act, authorizing the Corporation to resign the trusts held for the Divinity School and transfer them to a trustee to be appointed by the Supreme Court, this trustee to be either the Society for Promoting Theological Education, or any other suitable one. This act was approved March 27, 1858, and accepted by the Corporation nine months later on December 24. The Corporation then presented to the Supreme Court for the second time a petition for separation. In the petition the statement was made that the Corporation had tried to keep the School undenominational, but in spite of all that the Corporation could do, it was in reality a Unitarian School. The petition was opposed by the Society for Promoting Theological Education, which took the position that it was the proper trustee to accept the trust if a separation was granted, but maintained that the School was of great benefit to the College

and that "it would be false to all our traditions, if in a college named for a Puritan minister, fostered by a Puritan clergy, intended to be, and often called a 'School of the Prophets,' and bearing on its corporate seal the single motto of 'Christ and the Church,' religion should be the only subject deliberately excluded." The petition came before the court at the March term, 1859. The cause was argued in June, 1860. A long time passed and no decision was rendered. Finally in September, 1865, thirteen and a half years after the proceedings were begun, the Corporation, which in this period had largely changed its membership, voted to withdraw its petition. The respondents, desiring a judgment, objected in vain to this withdrawal, and the matter was closed without any change having been accomplished.

When this petition was presented, it contained a statement as to the land the Corporation proposed to convey to the new trustee with the Divinity School buildings. This land as described lay on both sides of Divinity Avenue. The following year, however, the Corporation conveyed some of this land to the Trustees of the Museum of Comparative Zoölogy for the new Museum. The Corporation then asked the Court for leave to amend its petition by giving a new description of this land. The new description showed the land entirely on the east side of Divinity Avenue, on which it had a frontage of about 620 feet. The other three sides adjoining the Palfrey, Norton and Rice estates.

We have now followed down the history of the school from the time when the line of cleavage between it and the College became first discernable, through a period when some of the College instructors gave some of their time to the Divinity School, and then some gave all their

time, and when later there was no one in the Faculty except the President, who was connected with the College. This centrifugal tendency was checked when the proposition of a complete separation came up and was rejected. I close with the beginning of the era that began in 1869. Two important but very different events occurred then. One was the absorption of the short-lived Boston School for the Ministry, by which all the students of this institution were allowed to enter the Divinity School without restriction. The other was the accession of a new President who took a deep interest in the welfare of the School, and inspired it with the same new life which was permeating other departments of the University. As President Kirkland, the one who one hundred years ago brought a new era into the College, was the leading one to found the Divinity School, so in these later years President Eliot, whose work for the College brought to it a similar but greater prosperity, was the guiding spirit in the changes of the Divinity School. Under him the swing of the school away from the College was reversed. The Divinity School professors became members of the College Faculty, college courses were opened to Divinity students, and Divinity courses to College students, and the School gradually became more and more an integral part of the University. As it was founded to give an opportunity for the liberal element of the Congregational Church which felt the need of such a school all the more because the conservative branch was represented in the new institution in Andover, so the same return swing of the pendulum with the same directing hand has brought together these two seminaries. And this introduces another new era.

THEOLOGICAL EDUCATION AT HARVARD BETWEEN 1816 AND 1916

By President-Emeritus Charles W. Eliot

The subject announced for my address today, "The Changes of a Century in Theological Education at Harvard," was too comprehensive for this occasion. Fortunately it was limited by the fact that the Rev. Earl Morse Wilbur gave last June an admirable address before the Alumni of the Harvard Divinity School on "The Changes wrought during a Hundred Years in the Liberal Movement," and on some of the most important actors in bringing about those changes; and by the further fact that the address of the Rev. Robert S. Morison before the present meeting was to deal with many interesting matters in the development of the Divinity School during its first half-century. Under these circumstances, I propose to limit myself to an exposition of the two principal series of events during the century from 1816–1916 in respect to theological instruction and education for the ministry at Harvard University. The first topic with which I propose to deal is the fifty years' struggle for the separation or elimination of professional theological education from Harvard University — a struggle which began in 1815 and ended only in 1865. The second topic of this address will be the details of the gradual, long-continued process by which the Harvard Divinity School was converted from a local School in which only Unitarians taught, studied, or were interested, into a School where instruction is given in all branches of theological learning by competent teachers drawn from several different denominations to students drawn from all parts

of the country, and from numerous colleges and theological seminaries. The School of to-day offers the following degrees: Bachelor of Theology, Master of Theology, and Doctor of Theology, all on examination after specified terms of residence. Students in the Divinity School may also, with the permission of the Divinity Faculty, become candidates for the degrees of Master of Arts, and Doctor of Philosophy under the Faculty of Arts and Sciences. All candidates for the degree of Bachelor of Theology must already have received the degree of Bachelor of Arts. In short, the Divinity School stands on the same academic footing as the other graduate schools of the University in respect to terms of admission and graduation, and enjoys the same atmosphere of freedom in research, inquiry, and exposition.

In dealing with my first topic — the proposed elimination of theological instruction from Harvard University — it will not be necessary to follow strictly the chronological order.

In 1852 the Divinity School was still under the direction — as it was in 1816 — of two professors, who divided between them systematic courses in Hebrew, the Criticism and Interpretation of the Scriptures, Natural and Revealed Religion, Systematic Theology, Church History and Polity, Homiletics, and Pastoral Care. Knowledge of Latin, Greek, elementary Mathematics, and the elements of Logic, Rhetoric, Philosophy, and Ethics on the part of all students was assumed. Every student was required to possess a copy of the Old and New Testaments in the original languages. As a University organization the Divinity School was entirely distinct from the College, except that the two professors in the Divinity School, namely the incumbents

of the Hollis Professorship (1721) and of the Parkman Professorship (1829), conducted prayers in the College Chapel. Both these Professors were Unitarians. At that time every member of the Corporation — the common name for the body called in the charter of 1650 the " President and Fellows of Harvard College " — was a Unitarian; and more than half of the members of the Board of Overseers were Unitarians, although the members of that Board, with the exception of seven ex-officio members, were then elected by the Massachusetts Senate. In the second term of the year 1852–53 James Walker, a Unitarian minister who received his theological education in the Harvard Divinity School, became President of the University, replacing Jared Sparks, also a Unitarian minister who received his professional training in the Harvard Divinity School. The three preceding presidents — Kirkland, Quincy, and Everett — had all been Unitarians, the first and third ministers and the second a layman. In the Board of Overseers of that year ten members out of thirty-seven were ministers, of whom eight were Unitarians. In that year also out of thirteen members of the College Faculty eleven were Unitarians, one a Friend, and one maintained no religious connections in this country, having been brought up in the Greek Church. Of the three hundred and nineteen undergraduates in Harvard College in 1852–53 only seventy-nine, or one-fourth, came from outside Massachusetts. Only four of the Massachusetts undergraduates came from Massachusetts as far west as the Connecticut River, and those four were from one town, Northampton. All the Divinity students with two exceptions came from New England; and those two were Harvard Bachelors of Arts.

Under these circumstances, in January, 1852, the Overseers appointed a committee to confer with the Corporation

on the existing relations between the College and the Divinity School. The object of the committee was to procure the separation of the Divinity School from Harvard College by the necessary judicial action. In September of the same year a bill in equity was filed by the Corporation submitting to the Judges of the Supreme Court " the propriety and expediency of separating the trustees of the Divinity School from those of Harvard College." The argument of the bill was essentially as follows: First, it has been ascertained by long and painful experience that the execution of the trusts the Corporation have assumed since 1815 for the Divinity School is incompatible with the successful execution of the prior trusts assumed for Harvard College. Secondly, it has become plain that the new trusts assumed for the Divinity School cannot be successfully executed by the Corporation and Overseers, — as is evidenced by the unsatisfactory state of the Divinity School. In other words, the bill urged that the assumption of the trusts for the Divinity School had interfered with the proper execution of the prior trusts for Harvard College, and that the attempt of the Corporation to execute the trusts they had assumed for the Divinity School had failed.

These were remarkable allegations considering that the original purpose of the foundation of Harvard College was to educate ministers for the Congregational churches of the Colony, and that this function for Colony, Province, and State had been amply fulfilled by Harvard College for several generations before the establishment of any distinct School of Theology was attempted. The real question raised was, whether an endowed university, fostered but not supported by the State, could properly contain a department of theological instruction. This question, obviously an intricate and far-reaching one in a country committed to

complete toleration in religion, had been under discussion among the friends of Harvard College and the Harvard Divinity School for more than a generation, the trend of opinion being clearly towards the separation of the Divinity School from the University. Since instruction in the theory and practice of the clerical profession and its appropriate learning has uniformly been excluded from the American universities supported by public taxation, we can appreciate to-day better than our predecessors of 1852 could the wide and deep significance of the policy towards that learned profession which the Corporation and Overseers in 1852 asked the Supreme Court to permit them to adopt.

The opinion of the Court was rendered two years later. No wonder that the first sentence in the opinion of the Court was in these words: "The present case is one of a deeply interesting character whether considered with reference to the general principles involved in it, or to its own intrinsic importance." The case was argued *ex parte*, no counsel appearing in opposition to the prayer of the Corporation; but the Court states that the counsel for the complainants presented not only their own arguments in favor of granting the prayer, but also the various objections to granting it. The Corporation did not claim that any donations made for theological instruction prior to the year 1815 — such as the funds of the Hollis Professorship of Divinity and the Hancock Professorship of Hebrew and other Oriental Languages — could be transferred from its hands to those of another independent trustee. It was conceded that those early funds ought to remain in the hands of the Governing Boards of Harvard College. Describing the nature and objects of the funds given since 1815, the Court calls attention to the fact that under date of December 18, 1815, a circular was issued by the President and

Fellows of Harvard College urging the adoption of " measures for increasing the means of theological education at the University." About $30,000 having been collected in answer to this appeal, a voluntary unincorporated society under the title of " The Society for the Promotion of Theological Education at Harvard University " was established at the suggestion of the Corporation. This Society acted jointly with the Corporation of the College in a few matters down to 1830; but Professors and Instructors in the Theological School were always chosen according to the usages of the University. After that date the whole management of the Divinity School was vested in the Government of the College. The Court pointed out that certain donations and bequests received since 1815 for purposes of theological instruction explicitly assumed that the President and Fellows of Harvard College have provided and are to provide instruction in Theology. This is true of the Samuel Parkman gift, and of the bequests of Sarah Jackson, Eliphalet Porter, George Partridge, Thomas Carey, John Foster, and Benjamin Bussey.

The decision of the Court is at pains to set forth that the questions raised by the Corporation's bill in equity had been discussed in the governing boards of the University in earlier years. Thus, it quotes from a report presented to the President and Fellows by a committee of their own number in May, 1827, the following sentence: " We think that the College government cannot with propriety alienate one of the chief departments of the institution committed to their care, and that to do so would defeat the declared object of the contributors to the theological fund which was to promote theological education in Harvard University." This report was accepted by the President and Fellows. In 1846, the Board of Overseers appointed a committee to

consider the expediency of disconnecting entirely the theological department from the College; and from the report of that committee the Court cites a passage to the effect that " all gifts and grants to the Divinity School at Harvard College, or at Cambridge, or to the Theological Institution at Cambridge, or for the promotion of theological education at Harvard College, or at Cambridge, or any equivalent expression indicating this object " . . . are " to be held in trust and applied conformably to the constitution and laws of that institution, and subject to the same superintendence and revision of the Board of Overseers as they are under in regard to funds appropriated to promote improvement in all branches of knowledge and all departments of education established therein, to the advancement of theological science and the promotion of theological education, as branches of education within the scope and purpose of an university." This report was accepted by the Overseers in 1846.

The decision of the Court summarizes fairly the arguments on which the President and Fellows of Harvard College mainly relied in asking to be relieved of the Theological School, and takes cognizance of the argument that Harvard University is in some sense a State institution, and that it is inconsistent with the general policy of the State that the University should teach a system of theology adopted and maintained by any peculiar denomination of Christians in opposition to the systems of other denominations. At the same time the Court notices the affirmation of the Corporation that there was no foundation for the alleged prejudice against Harvard College as a sectarian college; for it was not really such.

The Court denied the prayer of the complainants, the decision ending with the following striking paragraph:

A contrary decision would furnish a precedent dangerous to the perpetuity and sacredness of all our great public charities, leaving the question of the management and supervision of our public charities to be the subject of change with every fluctuation of popular opinion as to what may be the more expedient and useful mode of administering them.

In the annual report of the President of Harvard College to the Overseers for the year 1854–55, President Walker says: "Now that the long-pending question of a legal separation is settled, it is hoped that its (the Divinity School's) friends will be disposed, without further delay, to take the necessary steps to provide the additional instruction which has long been wanted, and to put the institution in all other respects on a satisfactory footing." But the long-pending question was not yet settled.

Not content to accept the decision of the Court as a settlement of the question they had raised in their petition for the separation of the Divinity School from the University, the Corporation and Overseers asked the Massachusetts Legislature of 1858 to authorize "the President and Fellows of Harvard College to resign all trusts heretofore assumed and accepted by them for the establishment and support of the Divinity School as a department of the University." The resulting act of the Legislature authorizes and empowers the President and Fellows of Harvard College, with the consent of the Board of Overseers, to resign the trusts heretofore assumed or accepted by them "for the establishment, maintenance, or support of a theological school as a department of the said College, or for the encouragement, support, or compensation of the teachers, professors, officers, or students of such theological school, or for the support of theological education in said College, or any of the same." The second section of this act authorizes the Supreme Judicial Court upon petition of said President and

Fellows of Harvard College to receive and accept such resignation, and thereupon to appoint "the Society for the Promotion of Theological Education, or any other suitable person, or persons, or corporation as the trustee, or trustees, in the place of the said President and Fellows of Harvard College." This act was approved in March, 1858. In March, 1859, the President and Fellows of Harvard College filed their petition to the Supreme Judicial Court resigning the trusts they had accepted for the maintenance of the Theological School, after having secured a statement from the Attorney-General of Massachusetts that he had no objection to make to that proceeding. The Society for the Promotion of Theological Education by a majority of its members consented to accept the trusts resigned by the President and Fellows. Thereupon ensued a long delay, the Court making no response to the petition of the Corporation. During this delay the Society for the Promotion of Theological Education underwent a change of mind, and became distinctly unwilling to accept the trusts which they had lately consented to receive from the Corporation through the Court. Moreover, many friends of the Divinity School and of Harvard College who had assented to the proceedings of the Corporation and Overseers with regard to the abandonment of theological education by Harvard University changed their minds, and began to hope, and finally to expect, that the Supreme Court would not grant the second petition of the President and Fellows.

In 1860–61, President Felton recurs to the subject in his annual report in the following terms:

> Nothing has yet been done towards separating the Divinity School from the University. Circumstances are now so different from the state of things at the time when this measure originated, that many who at first favored it now question the expediency of the change. A Theological Faculty is an essential part of a University

organization. . . . The time appears to have come when our oldest University may venture to regard Christian Theology as a divine science, above and beyond the restrictions of sect. It would seem to be, not only right, but politic, to consider the Theological Department as a proper School of Theology on the broadest basis, and to enlarge the means of instruction so as to meet the wants of the entire Christian Church, by selecting the most eminent Christian scholars, in whatever denomination found.

In 1860, 1861, and 1862, the Treasurer of the University, Mr. Amos A. Lawrence, who was a zealous member of the Protestant Episcopal Church, records in his annual statement that the separation of the Theological School from the College has not been accomplished.

In 1865, the Court having made no answer to the petition of the President and Fellows, the Corporation withdrew the petition. Thus, in the course of thirteen years, at the instance of the President and Fellows and through action by the Supreme Court and the Legislature of Massachusetts, it was settled that to supply theological instruction and to train ministers is a legitimate and, indeed, indispensable part of the function of Harvard University; and this settlement has proved generally acceptable to the governors, graduates, and supporters of the University, and to the community in which the University has grown up. The precedent thus established has value for other endowed universities in other commonwealths.

In the sentence quoted above from President Walker's report for 1854–55, he expressed the hope that the friends of the Divinity School would " take the necessary steps to provide the additional instruction which has long been wanted." In the fifteen years between 1854 and 1869 the following additions were made to the funds of the Divinity School:

A bequest of $1000 from Samuel Hoar,
" of $1000 from Caroline Merriman,
" of $5000 from Mary P. Townsend,
" of $2000 from Winthrop Ward, and
" of $2000 from J. Henry Kendall.

In 1861 the Bussey Trust — created in 1842 under the Will of Benjamin Bussey — became available for the purposes for which it was intended; and in this Trust the Divinity School had an interest to the extent of one-quarter of the income. These bequests, however, were in all probability not determined in any degree by the exhortation which President Walker published on behalf of the Divinity School in 1854. To all appearance the only response to the exhortation of President Walker came from the Society for the Promotion of Theological Education, which in 1857 voted " to furnish for the period of six years the sum of $1200 a year to be paid one-half to each of two professors in addition to those now employed, who are to furnish for this stipend instruction in Ecclesiastical History and Systematic Theology." The sum actually received from the Society each year was $600, beginning in 1858. Dr. Frederic H. Hedge taught Ecclesiastical History in the Divinity School from 1857 to 1878; and Dr. George E. Ellis taught Systematic Theology from 1857 to 1863. The number of lectures these gentlemen gave annually was, however, but small; because both were at the head of large parishes; but they were significant additions to the instruction then offered by the School.

One other event bearing on the disposition of the Governing Boards of the University towards professional training in theology should be adverted to before I take up my second topic — the development of theological instruction at the University between 1866 and 1916. When the Episcopal Theological School was established in Cambridge

in 1867–68, the announcement of the School appeared in the next annual Catalogue of Harvard University, and its students were all included in the summary of professional students and resident graduates who were members of the University; although the University had nothing to do with the business management of the School, no influence on the selection of its teachers, and no control over its course of instruction, or the administration of its degree. The announcement of the School made part of the annual catalogue of the University down to the catalogue of 1886–87; but its students were not enumerated as students of the University after 1876–77. From 1879 forward the announcement of the School in the Harvard Catalogue began with the phrases — " Established in 1867. (Not a part of the organization of Harvard University)." Obviously the Corporation and two successive Administrations welcomed the advent of the Episcopal Theological School to Cambridge, and disregarded legal limitations in admitting the School and its students to the University Catalogue. Objections to that practice began with members of the Board of Overseers who were lawyers.

I turn now to my second topic — the development of the Harvard Divinity School from a local School, undenominational in principle but in fact supported and used only by Unitarians, into a broad School of Scientific Theology and independent research.

There was but one member of the Corporation of 1852 in the Corporation of 1865 — Mr. John Amory Lowell, who served in that Board from 1837 to 1877. In the Corporation of 1868–69, which elected as President of the University a young Unitarian layman who had taught mathematics and chemistry in Harvard College for nine years (1854–63), and chemistry in the Institute of Tech-

nology for four years (1865–69) there were four members who were sitting in that Board in 1865, when the Corporation withdrew their second petition to the Supreme Court.

In the year 1876–77 three vacancies occurred in the Corporation, one by death, and two by resignation. It had long been the practice to have at least one minister in the Corporation; and that minister for two generations had been a Unitarian. It was therefore a significant innovation when Rev. Joseph Henry Thayer, a Professor in Andover Theological Seminary, was elected to the place vacated by the resignation of Rev. Dr. George Putnam. Another of the vacancies in the Corporation was filled by the reëlection to the Board of Martin Brimmer, who had already served as a Fellow from 1864–68. Mr. Brimmer was an Episcopalian. From the point of view of religious affiliations the Corporation of 1877–78 was strikingly different from any preceding nineteenth century Corporation.

By this same year the quality of the Board of Overseers had also changed somewhat under the influence of their election by the Alumni. There was a smaller proportion of ministers in the Board, and a greater variety of religious denominations was represented in the membership. These conditions in the two Governing Boards were favorable to the development in the University of a Faculty of Theology in which appointments should be made chiefly with reference to the scholarship and scientific spirit of the candidates, and their capacity for research as well as for teaching.

The appointment of Ezra Abbot as University Lecturer for 1870–71 and 1871–72 on the Sources, Principles, and History of Textual Criticism of the New Testament had

been the first indication of the tendency under the new administration to adopt this policy in regard to theological instructors at the University, — the policy of seeking eminent and broad-minded scholars for appointment in the Department of Theology just as the Corporation was accustomed to do in the Departments of Language, Mathematics, Engineering, History, and Biology. Mr. Abbot was appointed, not as a Unitarian theologian, but as a distinguished New Testament scholar. In 1872, when the Divinity School's share of the income of the Benjamin Bussey Fund became available, Ezra Abbot was appointed Bussey Professor of New Testament Criticism and Interpretation.

In 1880, the resignation of the Hancock Professorship by the Rev. Edward J. Young gave opportunity for the appointment of an Old Testament scholar without regard to denominational associations or previous connection with Harvard University. The scholar selected was Professor Crawford Howell Toy, who had recently retired from a Professorship of Hebrew in the Southern Baptist Theological Seminary at Louisville, Kentucky, because his views about Inspiration differed from those of the government of the Seminary. Mr. Toy took the highly esteemed degree of Master of Arts at the University of Virginia in 1856, and at once turned to the profession of teaching, with especial interest in the ancient languages. He was a Confederate soldier during the Civil War. At the close of the War, his father, in spite of heavy losses, was still able to maintain the scholarly son for two years at the University of Berlin, where he devoted himself to linguistic and historical studies. After two brief engagements as a college teacher, Dr. Toy was appointed in 1869 Professor of Hebrew in the Southern Baptist Theological Seminary

situated first in Greenville, S. C., and then in Louisville, Ky. He was a Baptist, and a remarkable Old Testament scholar; but he had not received the ordinary training of a Baptist minister. He was essentially a layman; although he had taken a short general course at the Baptist Seminary in Greenville and been ordained as a Baptist minister in 1860, when he had agreed to go as a missionary to Japan. During the ten years of his service at the Seminary, he proved himself a scientific philologist and a successful teacher. Gradually he formed opinions concerning biblical criticism which differed from those held by the Southern Baptist denomination. In 1879–80, Dr. Toy went to New York as Literary Editor of the 'Independent.' Soon after his acceptance of the Hancock Professorship Dr. Toy began his series of publications on the Old Testament and the History of Religions, which has continued to this day. The 18th century endowment of the Hancock Professorship was very small (about $6000); but in 1891 this endowment was re-enforced by the large bequest of Charles L. Hancock, so that the Hancock Professorship became one of the best endowed professorships in the University. Instruction in the University in Hebrew and other Oriental languages is therefore on a permanent footing.

In 1881–82, David Gordon Lyon, a student of Semitic languages and Assyriology, was appointed to the Hollis Professorship of Divinity (1721) which had been vacant for forty-two years. In this interval the Fund had accumulated from $3998.90 to $34441.96. The appointment of Dr. Lyon (Ph.D. University of Leipsig, 1882) was made with the intention of reinforcing the instruction in Semitic languages, Old Testament criticism, and Jewish history, all of which lay within the vast range of instruction which the original statutes of the Hollis Professorship

described. Dr. Lyon was a member of the Baptist church, and had been a pupil of Dr. Toy at the Southern Baptist Theological Seminary. The founder of the Hollis Professorship was a Baptist; but the incumbents of his Professorship had heretofore been Congregationalists or Unitarians. In 1891, when the Semitic Museum which Harvard University owes to Jacob H. Schiff needed a Curator, Dr. Lyon was appointed to that office, for which his knowledge of Assyrian civilization made him especially fit.

In the same year (1881–82) it became possible to appoint a Professor of Ecclesiastical History in the Divinity School; because the endowment of the new Winn Professorship of Ecclesiastical History (a Unitarian endowment) then became available. The person selected for this important chair was Ephraim Emerton, A.B. Harvard 1871, Ph.D. University of Leipsig, 1876, who had been six years Instructor in History in Harvard University. He was a layman; and brought to the study and teaching of Church History the new methods used in studying and expounding ancient and modern history in general.

Francis Greenwood Peabody was first appointed Lecturer on Ethics and Homiletics in the Divinity School in 1880–81. In the following year he was appointed Parkman Professor of Theology, the Parkman Endowment having been started by money raised by friends of the College in 1829, thirteen years after the date we celebrate today. As Parkman Professor he dealt at first chiefly with Homiletics and the Philosophy of Religion; but one course, given to the senior class once a week, bore the prophetic title "Practical Ethics." In 1882 there appears in the list of courses offered by the Department of Philosophy in Harvard College a course by Professor Peabody entitled

" Ethics in its Relation to Religion," and this course was also included among the courses of the Divinity School. In the following year this course was described as follows: " Ethical Theories and Social Problems. — Practical Examination of the Questions of Charity, Temperance, Labor, Prisons, Divorce, etc. — lectures and essays." Thereafter Professor Peabody maintained in both the College and the Divinity School a course on the " Practical Ethics of Modern Society — studies on social reforms." Professor Peabody was thus the first teacher to introduce into the curriculum of an American university systematic instruction in a subject of great practical value, which has since received a large development in colleges, universities, and theological seminaries throughout the country, and has become one of the principal subjects of discussion among active journalists and essayists in both Europe and America. Professor Peabody was a Unitarian minister before he became a professor. From the beginning he associated his social studies rather with the higher ethics than with economics; although he did not neglect this latter aspect of them. In recent years many of the discussions of these subjects give the economical considerations precedence over the religious. In consequence, some efforts have been made to achieve social reform by the improvement of physical or mechanical conditions rather than by the improvement of human character and conduct in the individual and in the mass. The results of these misdirected efforts are, of course, disappointing. In 1886, Professor Peabody was transferred from the Parkman Professorship to the Plummer Professorship of Christian Morals, and in that capacity had charge of the services in Appleton Chapel. Before he resigned the Plummer Professorship in 1913, he had the satisfaction of seeing the Department of Social

Ethics in Harvard University, as he developed it, permanently established on a substantial endowment, and well equipped with a departmental library and museum, and a habitation in Emerson Hall. This is one of the most characteristic and valuable additions made during the past forty-seven years to theological education in Harvard University; and it is all the more influential because it is also available in Harvard College and the Graduate School of Arts and Sciences.

The year 1882, so important in the development of the Divinity School, also marked the close of the sharp controversy within the Unitarian denomination between the conservatives and the progressives, which started with the delivery of Emerson's Divinity School address in 1838. That kind of conflict is, of course, perpetual in philosophy, religion, and politics, wherever freedom enough exists; but it was unusually acute within the Unitarian body between 1838 and 1882.

There were now (1882–83) six full professors in the Divinity Faculty against three in 1870.

In the President's report for 1882–83 the following paragraph describes the policy in regard to theological instruction which then commended itself to the Governing Boards, — and indeed still prevails in those Boards: —

" In pursuance of the general policy of the Divinity School to put fairly before its students, so far as its resources permit, the various theological opinions which prevail in the different Protestant denominations, Professor George T. Ladd, D.D., of Yale College, was invited to give a course of eight lectures before the School in the spring of 1883 on the doctrine of inspiration; and the course was given by this eminent teacher and author with great acceptance in the month of April. At about the same

time Rev. J. Henry Thayer, D.D., lately a professor in the Andover Theological Seminary, was appointed Lecturer on Biblical Theology for the ensuing academic year, and he is now delivering a course of weekly lectures on the doctrines of sin and redemption, as taught in the New Testament."

Dr. Thayer was then a Fellow of the Corporation. He had resigned his Professorship in Andover Theological Seminary, because the Trustees of that Seminary declined to make a public statement to the effect that they were in the habit of accepting from their Professors subscription to the creed of the Seminary with individual qualifications or reservations. In 1884, Dr. Joseph Henry Thayer was appointed to the Bussey Professorship of New Testament History and Interpretation made vacant by the death of Ezra Abbot. Dr. Thayer was appointed as a New Testament scholar of proved capacity as both teacher and investigator.

In the Spring of 1879 a subscription to increase the endowment of the Divinity School was begun under the direction of an influential committee appointed at a public meeting held in the First Church of Boston. This subscription yielded in that year about $86,000, subsequently increased to $138,000, if the Funds bearing the names of Thomas Tileston of New York (1879), Oliver Ames (1880), and Henry P. Kidder (1881) be included. This inclusion is fitting, because these three Funds were procured through the appeal of 1879. All this money came from Unitarian sources.

At the public meeting in the First Church of Boston held for the purpose of bringing the needs of the School before the public, I said:

The Harvard Divinity School is not distinctly Unitarian, either by its constitution or by the intention of its founders. The doctrines of the unsectarian sect, called in this century Unitarian, are indeed entitled to respectful exposition in the School so long as it exists, simply because the School has been founded, and for two generations at least has been supported, by Unitarians. . . . But the government of the University cannot undertake to appoint none but Unitarian teachers or to grant any peculiar favors to Unitarian students.

This statement of the position of the School was received with satisfaction by the Unitarian body and the Faculty of the Divinity School. In commenting upon it Dean Everett used these words in November, 1884:

The statement of the position of the School made by President Eliot (in 1879) was received with great satisfaction by the Unitarian body. The idea of a school in which Unitarians should have rights, but no monopoly, appealed to its sense of what was best for itself, and was most in harmony with its own principles. On the strength of the assurances thus given the money which was asked for was soon raised, — the gifts indeed overflowing the limit of the request.

Dean Everett added:

When it is remembered that with the exception of the Hancock and Hollis professorships which were founded before the School was established, the endowment of the School has been made by Unitarians, and when it is considered further that the Unitarian body is not merely one denomination among others, but that it differs from most other denominations on points in regard to which they are practically in accord, I think that it would be admitted that the Unitarian doctrine could not be regarded as respectfully entertained if it were not represented by at least two professors, one of whom should be a teacher of Theology.

and again:

While for the reasons that have been indicated certain professors may be selected as representing one denomination or another, it would obviously be a violation of the charter of the School and wholly foreign to its spirit to subject their teaching, or that of any instructor of the School, to a denominational standard. One great object of the Institution is to promote the scientific study of Theology, and this end would fail of accomplishment if any test were applied to its teaching of a nature different from that to which teachers of philosophy and science are subjected.

It is interesting to compare these official statements made from 1879 to 1884 with two paragraphs in the announcement of the Divinity School in the Harvard University Catalogue for 1915–16:

> The Constitution of the Divinity School prescribes that "every encouragement be given to the serious, impartial, and unbiassed investigation of Christian truth, and that no assent to the peculiarities of any denomination of Christians shall be required either of the instructors or students."
>
> The administration of the School is now carefully conformed to this principle. Various denominations are represented in its Faculty and among its students. The aim of its management is to maintain a school in which all matters connected with Theology shall be studied in a spirit as free as that in which Philosophy, History, and Classical Literature are studied in our colleges. At the same time, special attention is given to preparation for the practical work of the ministry. Large opportunity is offered for graduate study; and many of the students are graduates of other theological seminaries.

These passages from the catalogue announcement of the present Divinity School appeared first in the catalogue for the year 1897–98, and have been continued without change for nearly twenty years. The word "now" in the first line of the second paragraph refers to the year 1897. The above quotation from the Constitution of the Divinity School is taken from the declaration made on behalf of the Society for Promoting Theological Education at the time that Society was organized to coöperate with the Corporation of the University in advancing theological education.

In 1887–88, an addition was made to the teaching force by appointing James Richard Jewett (Harvard A.B. 1884) Instructor in Hebrew and other Oriental Languages. Mr. Jewett had just returned from three years in Syria and Egypt as the holder of a Harvard Travelling Fellowship for Semitic Languages. After an interesting career as a professor of Oriental languages and history at Brown

University, the University of Minnesota, and the University of Chicago, Professor Jewett rejoined the Faculty of the Harvard Divinity School in 1911 as Professor of Arabic.

In the early 90's it is noticeable that teachers connected with other Theological Seminaries were invited to take part in the instruction given at the Harvard Divinity School; thus, in the year 1889–90 Professor Alexander V. G. Allen of the Episcopal Theological School in Cambridge lectured on Ecclesiastical History. In 1891–92, Professor William Jewett Tucker of the Andover Theological Seminary lectured at the Divinity School on Pastoral Care and the Conduct of Worship. Professor John Wesley Churchill of the Andover Theological Seminary was Instructor in Elocution in the Harvard Divinity School from 1890–96.

In my report for 1892–93 I said:

> The undenominational aspect of the School was again emphasized by inviting Professor John Edward Russell, now of Williams College, but lately a professor in the Yale Divinity School, to lecture on Theology in place of Professor Everett, who was to have leave of absence during the year now current. Bishop John H. Vincent of the Methodist Episcopal Church and Dr. Washington Gladden of the Congregational Church were also appointed lecturers for the current academic year.

In 1894–95, Professor George F. Moore, of the Andover Faculty, lectured at the Divinity School on the Hebrew Religion and Literature. The Divinity Faculty was also reënforced in more permanent ways during the nineties. In 1897, Edward Hale, who had for one year acted as Assistant in Homiletics, was made Assistant Professor of that subject. In 1895, James Hardy Ropes was made Instructor in New Testament Criticism and Interpretation, and held this place until 1898, when he was promoted to be Assistant Professor of New Testament Criticism and

Interpretation. At the expiration of his term as Assistant Professor in 1903, Mr. Ropes was promoted to the Bussey Professorship of New Testatment Criticism and Interpretation which Professor Joseph Henry Thayer had resigned in 1901. The relations between Professor Thayer and Professor Ropes as teacher and pupil had long been intimate. They were in all respects sympathetic and coöperative in New Testament studies; and their religious views were well nigh identical. Both were Congregationalists, and firm believers in Congregational polity.

In the President's Report for 1902–03, I remarked that " the relations of the Divinity School with the Graduate School and the College become more and more intimate, — a natural result at Harvard University, considering that the chief object in view when the College was founded was the education of ministers. Philosophical, historical, sociological, and linguistic studies are appropriate to all three departments."

Dean Peabody in his report for the year 1902–03 pointed out that Divinity students elected 25 courses offered only by the Faculty of Arts and Sciences, of which number Philosophy counted 12; and that non-Divinity students elected 253 courses offered by the Divinity School as follows:

Old Testament . . .	58 elections	History of Religions	44 elections
New Testament . .	11 "	Theology	2 "
Church History . .	11 "	Social Questions .	127 "

In the same report Dean Peabody printed a table giving the distribution by denominations of the ministers who in the course of five years ending with 1903 had attended the Summer School of the Divinity School. These ministers were connected with thirteen different denominations, the largest number coming from the Orthodox Congregational denomination, and the next largest from the Protestant

Episcopal denomination. In my report of that year the following passage occurs:

> The two professions in which transformation and progress have been the most rapid during the last fifteen years are theology and medicine; and it is interesting to observe that in both these professions young men who have already been at work some years find it desirable to return to the University in search of the new knowledge and the new skill. It is also to be observed that these two professions, in which both their philosophies and their practices have been recreated within recent years, are the altruistic professions in which may best be combined the two passions most characteristic of the present generation, — the passion for truth and the passion for service.

In 1896, John Winthrop Platner, a graduate of Yale and of the Union Theological Seminary of New York, was appointed Assistant Professor of Ecclesiastical History, and immediately supplemented the instruction given by Professor Emerton by offering courses on the History of the Early Church with Special Reference to the Patristic Literature, and on Selections from the Early Christian Apologists, and from the Ecclesiastical History of Eusebius. This addition was made possible by using for the first time the income of the Frothingham Fund received in 1892–93 and accumulated till it reached $37,000.

When Charles Carroll Everett, Bussey Professor of Theology, died in 1900 after an invaluable service of twenty-one years, the vacancy was filled by the appointment of William Wallace Fenn, Harvard A.B. 1884, S.T.B. and A.M. (Harvard) 1887. Mr. Fenn was at the time pastor of a Unitarian church in Chicago; but he was also well known to the authorities of the University as a successful student of Literature and Theology. His appointment carried out the understanding with the subscribers to the new endowment in 1879 with regard to the respectful exposition of Unitarian doctrines in the School. Professor Fenn suc-

ceeded Professor Peabody as Dean of the Faculty of Divinity in 1906.

The Parkman Professorship of Theology (1814) was vacant from 1886 to 1901 because of the inadequacy of the Fund ($16,000); but in 1901 this Professorship was filled by the election of Edward Caldwell Moore. Professor Moore was a graduate of Marietta College (O.) and of the Union Theological Seminary (N. Y.), and was pastor of an important Congregational church in Providence, R. I. He entered upon his work at the School in the following year taking part in the instruction in Homiletics, and offering a course on the "History of Christian Thought since Kant, including a Discussion of the Present State and Tendencies of Theological Thought." Professor Moore now holds both the Parkman Professorship and the Plummer Professorship of Christian Morals.

In 1901–02 George Foot Moore, President of the Andover Theological Faculty, was appointed Professor of Theology in Harvard University, and gave during that year a half-course on the "Interpretation of Selections from the Old Testament and later Jewish Writings illustrating Conceptions of the Efficacy and Operation of Sacrifice," and another half-course on "A General Introduction to the Study of Religion, Psychological and Historical"; thus entering at once on public teaching of the subject which has ever since engaged his attention, — Comparative Religion. In 1904, Professor Moore was transferred to the partially endowed Frothingham Professorship of the History of Religion, for him the most appropriate chair in the University. Professor George F. Moore was a graduate of Yale, 1872, and of Union Theological Seminary, 1877. He was for five years in the Presbyterian ministry, and then Professor of Hebrew in Andover Theological Seminary for nine years.

At the time of his first appointment in the Harvard Divinity School as Lecturer (1894–95) his high reputation as an Old Testament scholar was fully established through his publications and his teaching at Andover.

From 1901 to 1911 (at the latter date Professors Jewett and Arnold (Andover) were taking active part in the teaching of Hebrew) an Instructor or Austin Teaching Fellow in Semitic Langauges was steadily employed. This Instructorship after a lapse of one year reappeared in 1912 and continued for three years.

In 1909 when Dr. Toy retired from the Hancock Professorship, Dr. Lyon was transferred from the Hollis Professorship to the Hancock, and Professor Ropes from the Bussey Professorship to the Hollis. Thereupon one of the two Bussey Professorships which had been maintained in the Divinity School since 1872 disappeared. The instruction offered by the School was not diminished in consequence of these changes; because the professors of the Andover Theological Seminary were already giving many valuable courses which were accessible to students in the Harvard Divinity School.

During the years 1905–06 and 1906–07 the removal of Andover Theological Seminary to Cambridge, and its affiliation with Harvard University were repeatedly discussed in a tenative way by members of the Andover Board of Trustees and the President of the University; but it was not till January, 1908, that the President and Fellows received from the Trustees of the Seminary a definite plan providing for the removal of the Seminary to Cambridge and its affiliation with the University. Discussion of this plan in the Harvard Divinity Faculty resulted in some amendments which were in turn discussed with representatives of the Seminary Trustees.

On the 24th of February, 1908, the President presented to the Corporation a communication from the Trustees of Andover Theological Seminary proposing the removal of the Seminary to Cambridge, and its affiliation with Harvard University in accordance with the following plan upon which the action of the Governing Boards of the University was invited. (*President's Report for 1907–08.*)

Both Boards promptly took affirmative action; so that the Seminary Trustees immediately bought an ample lot of land adjoining the site of the Divinity School, and made ready to erect a spacious and substantial building for the use of the Seminary.

The main features of this memorable agreement were as follows:

Each School or Seminary is to retain its autonomy and independence. The Faculty of each School shall be appointed as heretofore. Each Faculty shall manage its own degree or degrees.

"In general the two institutions enter into mutual agreement to avoid all rivalry, competition, and needless duplication of courses; and to combine the resources of instruction in both institutions in an economical, harmonious, and comprehensive scheme of theological education."

"The Theological Faculties of the two institutions shall arrange for some systematic method of mutual conference, to suggest, plan, and coördinate courses of instruction with a view to the harmonious enlargement of the opportunities for theological study given in the two institutions."

"Both institutions will endeavor to make and keep the standards of admission and graduation, scholarship aid, fees, and general charges equal in the two schools, as far as practicable."

"Any arrangement with Harvard University under this plan shall be terminable by either party with two years' notice."

Since 1908 the following paragraph has appeared in the announcement of the Harvard Divinity School in the Annual Catalogue of the University, with a list of the Andover professors in Harvard University:

Courses given by teachers in Harvard University, if approved for that purpose by the Seminary, are accepted for the Andover degree of Bachelor of Divinity, and courses given by teachers in the Seminary, if approved for that purpose by the Harvard Faculty of Divinity, are accepted for the Harvard degree of Bachelor of Divinity. Professors in Andover Seminary whose courses are accepted for the Harvard degree of Bachelor of Divinity are appointed Andover Professors in Harvard University.

In that year four Andover professors took part in the instruction offered at the Harvard Divinity School. In 1910–11 six Andover professors took similar part. The plan for the affiliation of Andover Theological Seminary with Harvard University had throughout an aspect of permanence and of coöperative application of the resources of the two institutions for theological instruction and the training of ministers. The immediate removal of the Seminary to Cambridge emphasized both the expected permanence and the coöperative nature of the agreement. A physical illustration of the coöperation intended was the uniting of the Library of the Divinity School with that of the Andover Theological Seminary in the Andover building, and under the care of the Andover librarian.

In 1914 an agreement was made with the Episcopal Theological School of Cambridge providing for an affiliation of that School with Harvard on terms similar to those contained in the agreement with Andover Theological Seminary. There was, however, one decided difference between the two agreements. Under the agreement with Andover when students in that Seminary chose courses given by teachers in Harvard University, the Seminary paid to the University the usual fees for those courses, and vice versâ when students in Harvard University chose courses given by Professors of the Andover Theological Seminary, the University paid to the Seminary the usual

fees for such courses. In practice there was each year a balance of these payments in favor of the University. In the arrangement with the Episcopal Theological School all fees were dispensed with by both parties. In consequence the original agreement with Andover Theological Seminary was modified in the same sense. In one important respect, however, the two agreements were alike. Both raised the tuition fee in the affiliated School to the level of the Divinity School fee, which for several years had been $150 a year — an unprecedented fee for a theological seminary. The fact that the buildings of the Episcopal Theological School were within easy reach of the Divinity School, and all its professors lived in Cambridge close by the University made the agreement between the University and the School seem feasible and likely to be permanent. In the announcement of the Divinity School for 1915–16 the whole Faculty of the Episcopal Theological School appeared as teachers whose courses were open to students in the Harvard Divinity School; namely, five professors and one assistant professor.

In January, 1915, an arrangement was made between Harvard University and the Boston University School of Theology (Methodist) in the following terms:

> For two years, beginning September 1, 1915, graduate students in the Boston University School of Theology and students in the senior class who are candidates for the degree, who have attained an average grade of not less than 85 per cent during their two previous years in the School, may with the approval of both Faculties, register in the Harvard Divinity School and take without charge a maximum of two Harvard courses as part of their year's work in the Boston University School of Theology, it being understood that this agreement does not oblige an instructor to give any course which would not be given were it not for students in Boston University School of Theology.

This arrangement resembled in spirit those already made with Andover Seminary and the Episcopal School; but

was much more limited. It proposed no coöperative action, no reciprocal advantages, and no additional expenditures at either institution. It was good evidence, however, that Harvard University would gladly receive without any compensation competent students of theology who were connected with institutions for training ministers without regard to the denominations into whose service the young men were expected to enter.

In November, 1915, an agreement was made between the Newton Theological Institution (Baptist) and Harvard University which was also to come to an end on September 1, 1917, and was identical with that made with Boston University, except that in this agreement the security for the competency of the Newton students, who were to be admitted to the Harvard Divinity School without charge, was distinctly reduced. It required that Seniors in the Newton Theological Institution who were to attend Harvard courses should have obtained an average grade of not less than 85 per cent during only one year in the Institution instead of during two years as the agreement with Boston University had prescribed.

The registration of students in the Divinity School coming from the four affiliated institutions in 1914–15, 1915–16, and a part of the registration for 1916–17 is as follows:

	1914–15	1915–16	1916–17
Andover students	29	25	22
Episcopal Theological School students	13	5	3
Boston University School of Theology students	..	15	5
Newton Theological Institution students	..	..	5
	42	45	35

The registration for the year now current is not comparable to the registration for the two preceding years; because students coming from the affiliated Schools register at the Mid-Year for courses to be given in the second half-year.

In the announcement of the Divinity School for 1914–15, four new teachers appear in the Faculty. Three of them dealt with subjects which had for many years belonged in the province of Professor Francis Greenwood Peabody, who had lately resigned the Plummer Professorship of Christian Morals. Rev. Frederic Palmer, Harvard A.B. 1869, a graduate of Andover Theological Seminary in 1872, who had lately retired from the charge of an Episcopal church in Andover, was appointed Lecturer on Homiletics. Henry Wilder Foote, Harvard A.M., 1900, and Harvard S.T.B., 1902, was appointed Assistant Professor of Preaching and Parish Administration, and also Secretary of the Faculty. Mr. Foote had been for four years Secretary in the department of Education of the American Unitarian Association, and in that office he had shown decided administrative capacity. His experience as a minister was obtained at two outposts of that denomination — at New Orleans (1902–06), and at Ann Arbor (1906–10). At New Orleans his church served in some degree teachers in Tulane University. At Ann Arbor, his church was placed beside the great University of Michigan, and teachers and students in the University made up more than half of the congregation. The appointment of Mr. Foote was intended to increase the attention paid by the School to the practical problems of a modern church and to the pastoral relations of ministers. Robert Franz Foerster, Harvard Ph.D. 1909, Assistant Professor of Social Ethics, was made a member of the Divinity Faculty to represent in the School the Department of Social Ethics which Professor Peabody had created. The fourth addition to the Faculty that year was Kirsopp Lake, M. A. Oxford, England, 1897, who was appointed Professor of Early Christian Literature. Dr. Lake is one of the most distinguished of English scholars

in the study of the New Testament and of the Pagan philosophies and practices which modified Christianity during the first three centuries. He is a clergyman of the Anglican church, who held a professorship of Early Christian Literature in the University of Leiden from 1904 to 1914. His publications have dealt chiefly with texts of the New Testament, and texts relating to Ecclesiastical History which have been discovered in the monasteries of Mt. Athos.

That year the Divinity Faculty contained nine Professors and two Assistant Professors; and there were, besides, six Andover Professors in Harvard University who gave instruction in theology.

The influence of the Divinity School on the development of scholarship among members of the clerical profession has been enlarged by the publication of the Harvard Theological Review, the first number of which was issued in January, 1908. The Review offers a forum for the free discussion of all subjects which are of interest to students of Theology in any of its branches, or to settled ministers. It has a moderate circulation of good quality. The Review, having a small endowment which came from the estate of the late Professor Charles Carroll Everett through his daughter Mildred, is likely to be maintained permanently.

The Harvard Divinity School maintained a Summer School of Theology from 1899–1910 inclusive. The School was highly interesting, because of the number of denominations represented in the students attending it, and in the corps of instructors. The students were chiefly settled ministers who gave up the greater part of their vacation to serious work in Cambridge in midsummer. Teachers and students worked zealously together in one and the same free and tolerant spirit. The Summer School has been

suspended since 1910, partly because it was never pecuniarily successful, and its deficit had to be paid from the unrestricted income of the Divinity School itself. Two useful lessons were to be learnt from its twelve years' experience: Lectures on theology were more welcome than any other, except lectures on social ethics. The alert settled minister has a keen desire for more knowledge of social ethics and its applications. The modern priests and Levites are sincerely anxious to avoid the condemnation — they "passed by on the other side." The conscientious minister in most of the Protestant denominations really wishes to learn how to be charitable and merciful without doing society more harm than good. In consequence of this prevailing desire for sociological information a Summer School of Theology can be most advantageously conducted in a large city, where the working of all sorts of good social agencies on a crowded and miscellaneous population can be studied. But another longing of young ministers brought up in strict denominational enclosures is for free and varied instruction in theology and the philosophy of religion, such as the Harvard Divinity School provides. It is much to be wished that the Harvard Summer School of Theology might be reëstablished with the aid of a small endowment. Because of the low pay of young ministers, it will never be possible to make a worthy summer course in Theology self-supporting. The tuition-fee cannot be put high enough.

Such is the natural and admirable outcome in a hundred years of the declaration made in 1816 by the Society for Promoting Theological Education which has been referred to in a long series of annual announcements as the Constitution of the Harvard Divinity School, namely, that "every encouragement be given to the serious, impartial,

and unbiassed investigation of Christian truth, and that no assent to the peculiarities of any denomination of Christians shall be required either of the instructors or students." This was a remarkable foundation for a School of Theology in 1816, and the outcome is equally remarkable in 1916. You who are graduates of the Divinity School and lovers of its free spirit are so accustomed to this atmosphere of liberty and hospitality that you may easily fail to realize how exceptional it is in the history of theological education. Indeed, it is unique. It is not until we frankly contrast it with the designs and principles which have almost universally prevailed in theological education that we really appreciate the Constitution and method of the Harvard Divinity School. Let us consider, for example, a single illustration of the historical type of theological seminary in the Protestant denominations of this country. In 1811, the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church in the United States of America adopted a Plan of the Theological Seminary of that Church located in Princeton, N. J. I quote from the second edition of this Plan printed at Elizabethtown in 1816, the identical year in which the Harvard Divinity School was organized. In the introduction the founders of this Presbyterian Seminary declared their design under several heads. The first object stated is as follows:

> It is to form men for the Gospel ministry, who shall truly believe, and cordially love, and therefore, endeavour to propagate and defend, in its genuineness, simplicity, and fulness, that system of religious belief and practice which is set forth in the Confession of Faith, Catechisms, and Plan of Government and Discipline of the Presbyterian Church; and thus to perpetuate and extend the influence of true evangelical piety, and Gospel order.
>
> Another object is "to provide for the Church men who shall be able to defend her faith against infidels, and her doctrines against heretics."

Another object " is to preserve the unity of our Church by educating her ministers in an enlightened attachment, not only to the same doctrines, but to the same plan of government."

This Theological Seminary was to be conducted by the General Assembly " so that that body is to be considered at all times as its patron, and the fountain of its Powers." Article I, Section 2, declares that " the General Assembly shall choose a Board of Directors consisting of twenty-one ministers and nine ruling elders, by whom the Seminary shall be inspected and conducted." The third section provides " that all professors of the Seminary shall be appointed by the Assembly." Article II of this Plan relates to the powers of the Board of Directors. Its eighth section provides " that the Board shall direct the professors of the Seminary in regard to the subjects and topics on which they are severally to give instructions to the pupils." Section 11 provides " that the Board of Directors shall inspect the fidelity of the professors, especially in regard to the doctrines actually taught." Article III of the Plan relates to the professors. Section 3 of this article provides that every person elected to a professorship in this Seminary shall make the following solemn declaration:

" In the presence of God and of the directors of this Seminary, I do solemnly, and ex animo adopt, receive, and subscribe the Confession of Faith, and Catechisms of the Presbyterian Church in the United States of America, as the confession of my faith; or, as a summary and just exhibition of that system of doctrine and religious belief which is contained in holy Scripture, and therein revealed by God to man for his salvation; and I do solemnly ex animo profess to receive the Form of Government of said Church, as agreeable to the inspired oracles."

Section 10 of the same article empowers the faculty

" to dismiss from the Seminary any student who shall prove unsound in his religious sentiments; immoral or disorderly in his conduct; or who may be, in their opinion, on any account whatsoever, a dangerous, or unprofitable member of the Institution."

Article IV of this Plan deals with study and attainments. The following section describes one of the attainments which every student at the close of his course must have made:

"He must be able to support the doctrines of the Confession of Faith and Catechisms, by a ready, pertinent, and abundant quotation of Scripture texts for that purpose."

These restrictive or precautionary measures reappear in the present (1915) amended Plan of the Theological Seminary of the Presbyterian Church of the United States of America, accompanied in each case by the footnote, "this section has never been changed."

The Constitution and objects of this historic Presbyterian Seminary are typical. All denominational theological seminaries in the United States have had, and many still have, qualities and aims analogous to those set forth in the "Plan of the Theological Seminary of the Presbyterian Church adopted by the General Assembly of 1811." In respect to the liberty of teacher and pupil the contrast between such institutions and the Harvard Divinity School is sharp.

This survey of the progress of one hundred years in regard to the teaching of Theology and the kindred subjects at Harvard University shows that in the first half of the century theological instruction and the training of ministers were proved to be proper and permanent parts of the University's function; and that in the last half of the century the resources of the University for those purposes in funds, books, and collections were considerably increased, and were placed at the disposal of an increasing number of competent students attached through birth, natural affinity, or choice to a large variety of Protestant denomi-

nations. The University has thus promoted theological, linguistic, and historical research, the professional training of ministers, and Christian unity. I believe that no theological schools except those which make part of genuine universities can perform such services as these for the American community; and that it is of utmost importance that such services be rendered. The educated class in the American democracy no longer respects research or inquiry conducted under traditional restraints or previous committals. It no longer respects learned professions which are not perfectly free to welcome new light, and to change both opinions and practices. The future of the clerical profession in this country depends on its conforming in its training and its professional conduct to the standards in truth-seeking which modern science has set up.

THE VESPER SERVICE

The Vesper Service was conducted in Divinity Chapel by Dean W. W. Fenn, who made a brief address. In the course of the service the following hymns, which had been especially written for the occasion, were sung.

Tune: PENTECOST

O Thou, to whom the fathers built
  Their altars in the ancient days,
Upon our worship we invoke
  The benediction of their praise;

As then their reverent hearts received
  The Spirit's gift of flame from Thee,
So on our altars kindle now
  Fires of ancestral piety.

Thou living, radiant, inward Light!
  Whom we today, though dimly, see, —
Our guide amid the world we know,
  Our hope for what is yet to be, —

Break now, in greater majesty,
  Upon the minds and hearts that crave
With widening knowledge of the Truth
  Triumphant power to seek and save.

God of the ages yet unborn!
  Whose clearer presence then shall shine,
When man with man shall live in peace,
  And human life become divine;

O touch our lips that we may be
  The messengers of Thy swift word,
And with prophetic power proclaim
  The growing purpose of the Lord!

FREDERICK MAY ELIOT.

Tune: INNOCENTS

Joy of morning in the skies,
Unseen Wings of glad sunrise,
Wakening all the lands anew,
Radiant in each drop of dew;

Joy of morning in the slow
Upward climb of life aglow, —
Rock and flower and beast, and face
Of the coming angel's grace;

Joy of morning in the soul,
Lighting man from goal to goal,
Ever in wild hearts of youth
Visioning the greater truth;

Joy of morning's break of song
Mid dark histories of wrong,
Through inexplicable ways
Prelude sure of happier days;

Joy of morning, victor still
Over starless nights of ill,
Rend once more the clouds of death,
Come, O God, the Living Breath!

Hate and harm are not the last,
War shall yet be overpast, —
Come, O Wings of glad sunrise,
God's great morning in the skies!

WILLIAM CHANNING GANNETT.

Tune: ROCKINGHAM

As at this hallowed shrine we meet
We grateful own the heritage
Of widening vision, thought and faith
Revealing truth from age to age.

Yet in this hour their nearer claim
Speaks to us all with deep appeal, —
The forbears of our household name
Whose lives within our own we feel.

Unbound by outgrown rite and creed,
Yet nurtured from a living past,
They dared to trust the Spirit's lead
Nor deemed its latest word the last.

Within these walls what visions wake
Of friendly guides, of prophet, seer:
What voices call and vocal make
The silence to the inward ear!

Here be our holiest vows renewed,
Here be reconsecrate our powers:
The love of truth, the prayerful mood
That stayed the fathers still be ours!

FREDERICK LUCIAN HOSMER.

SPEECHES AT THE DINNER

THE dinner of the Alumni Association was held in the Harvard Union, about one hundred and fifty persons being present, including members of the Alumni Association, former students in the School, and, as invited guests, the heads of the affiliated theological schools, President A. P. Fitch, Dean George Hodges, Dean L. J. Birney, and President G. E. Horr, and members of the Society for the Promotion of Theological Education. Grace was said by Rev. Raymond Calkins, D.D. ['96]. At the conclusion of the dinner Professor Peabody called the company to order and the exercises were opened with the singing of the Divinity School hymn, "Kind Mother of Truth," written by Professor Ephraim Emerton. The following addresses were then delivered:

PROFESSOR PEABODY

We have heard, this afternoon, the dramatic story of our School — its modest beginnings, its obstacles without, and its contentions within, — and to-night we are to hear from our brethren and guests their prophecies of a larger usefulness. In these tragic days of war it is not infrequently suggested that the Christian religion has proved itself bankrupt; that a *moratorium* might as well be declared for Christian preaching; and that the ideals of Christian faith have proved themselves an illusion from which the world has been abruptly and barbarously waked. And certainly there are many aspects of Christian life and teaching which, when they were touched by the fire of this calamity have shrivelled

into impotency, and it is difficult to believe that the world will ever care again for the contentions of the churches or the pretensions of the priests. Forms and ceremonies, orthodoxies and heresies, which have seemed to many minds supremely interesting, have not been able to restrain the passions of men or even the instincts of beasts. However interesting these matters may still remain to belated ecclesiastics, it is not likely that after this carnage is ended people will, as a whole, regard them as anything more than historical curiosities. Men who have been face to face with eternity every hour are not likely to return — if indeed they do return — to be deeply concerned for heresy trials and the fripperies of ecclesiastical life.

And yet this wholesale demolition of the accessories of religion may mean, not a collapse of Christian faith, but on the contrary, a new revelation of its power, vitality, and permanence, when spiritually interpreted and rationally received. The fact is that this modern tragedy in these awful years is teaching the world, not that there is nothing left of religion, but that there is nothing but religion left. Never was there a time when the human need of a living, loving God was so felt; never such an imperative call for a merciful Father, and never therefore such an opportunity for those who have been delivered from the complexities of theological or ecclesiastical bondage, and are pledged to stand fast in the liberty wherewith Christ has set them free. In this hope for the world's future, then, we take our place, trusting that from this School of the Prophets may come, as in other times have come, those who shall greet the new age with a fraternal hope, and that we, in our own place may commit ourselves with a new patience to our little share in the creation of a better and more peaceful world.

When Dean Everett died it seemed to those who had studied with him as though a great light had gone out of our sky. His was a Johannean character, — serene and lovable, as one who leaned upon the Master's breast, and learned his secret. I was crossing the Delta only yesterday when I met the present successor of Dr. Everett, and I remarked to Dean Fenn that I had occupied that leisure which the University confers upon Emeriti Professors by a fresh study this summer of the Apostle Paul. Dean Fenn humorously replied that the Apostle Paul always reminded him of Dr. Bellows, but, as I went my way, it occurred to me that the analogy might be brought a little closer. The Apostle Paul was one of the greatest of systematic theologians, but he was not less a mystic of the purest type. He was the humblest of disciples, — not worthy in his own estimation to be called a disciple, — yet he did not hesitate to confront the other disciples face to face and tell them they were wrong. He was like that Scotchman who was willing to be convinced, but would like to see the man who could convince him. He was a master in theological controversy, but he was not less the apostle of love. "Yet show I unto you a more excellent way." Am I speaking of a man of the first century or of the twentieth? I present to you Dean Fenn.

DEAN W. W. FENN

REPRESENTING THE SCHOOL

BRETHREN OF THE ALUMNI: Some years ago I received a very polite note from an estimable lady in Boston asking me to call upon her with reference to a matter of vital interest to the Harvard Divinity School. It may be that the savory suggestion of a benefaction made the response a little more prompt than it might otherwise have been, but I was somewhat disappointed and grieved to find that the good lady

had a concern of mind, as Friends say, about certain teachings which had been reported to her as coming from members, or a member, of the Faculty of the Harvard Divinity School, which seemed to her subversive of Christianity, and even of religion, as well as ruinous to young men proposing to enter the Christian Ministry. I have n't the remotest idea who the heretic was, but the good lady was astonished when I told her that I, as Dean of the School, had absolutely nothing in the world to do with the teachings of my colleagues; that the members of the Faculty were appointed by the Corporation on the ground of academic qualifications, and that I had not the power, even if I had the willingness, to suppress heresy. But the interview showed very clearly that the constructive principle of this School has not been apprehended by the popular mind; neither has it been apprehended thoroughly in academic circles.

Not very long ago a Professor in another theological institution, a man of vigorous and progressive thinking, complained to me because a teacher in one of the theological schools of his own denomination, carrying a doctor's degree from Harvard, was teaching as if the Higher Criticism had never been born, and he remarked that it was a downright disgrace to Harvard University that its highest degree should be carried by a man who is so reactionary. What could I say to him save that this man knew the methods and the results of the Higher Criticism, and deliberately, with full knowledge, rejected them, and that our degree was based upon knowledge, and not upon conclusions. And yet it seemed almost impossible for my colleague to grasp that idea. Now if that is the case with the academic mind, you can not expect it to be otherwise with the popular mind. " If gold rust, what shall iron do? "

Nevertheless, we believe in that idea, and we are thoroughly and consistently devoted to it. We treat the students who come here as men capable of hearing different opinions and forming their own judgments concerning them, and if they are not this is no place for them. Would it be believed that I have heard it said to the disparagement of Dean Everett, that he never founded a School of theological thinking? Can you not imagine the look of benign, beautiful humor that would have overspread his face if he could have heard that criticism.

And now, what about the success of the School during these hundred years? Numerically, it has not been great. We are in no boastful mood. During the century some fifteen hundred men have been connected with the School. Our sister institution, Andover, during her first century which ended in 1908, numbered over thirty-five hundred students. Our numbers have been comparatively small, but we believe that the School has had an influence quite disproportionate to its numbers. It is much that this School has given four Presidents to Harvard University. It is much that it has trained scholars like those whose names are in our minds tonight. It is much that this School has sent forth men of influence like Emerson, Parker, Higginson, and many others. It is much that it gave William G. Eliot to St. Louis, Thomas L. Eliot to Portland, Oregon, Hosmer to Buffalo, Furness to Philadelphia, Samuel J. May to Syracuse, and Henry W. Bellows to New York. Who would think of writing the history of these cities without recording the work which was done by these our graduates? It is a great deal that we have had men whose praises, in their hymns, are in all the churches; men like Sears, Gannett, Hosmer, Samuel Longfellow, and Chadwick. It is also an interesting fact that of the some five hundred men

who were connected with the School from 1876 to 1906 about one in seven has been eminent enough to be mentioned in "Who's Who." Of course when you see some of the names, you realize that that does not mean everything, but it certainly means something, and it is worth recording.

In other respects, also, the School may have proved a disappointment, and it is probably true that in some measure its prosperity has been injuriously affected by fidelity to its central principle. The world does not march steadily and evenly forward. It wabbles along toward its goal, and if it gains a little on one side it loses on the other. We have to pay our price for things, and if we are to be loyal to one purpose it is sometimes necessary to sacrifice other things, and that, I think, has been the case with our School. But, after all, the central thing is that we have maintained the principle on which this School was established. Fifty years ago, at the time of the Semi-Centennial, a controversy was raging in the School, and in successive numbers of the *Christian Register* there were letters by prominent clergymen, one of whom lived in Cambridge, condemning the School, and the young men who were studying here. It was said that a scientific teaching in theology never can prepare men for the Christian ministry and that those young radicals had no right to think of becoming Christian ministers. One of the "Crazy radicals" replied and his name was William C. Gannett, whose hymn we sang to-night. We have no conception of the opposition which this School had to face, from its friends more often than from its foes, yet on the whole it has well maintained its principle of freedom, and of that we have a right to be proud.

I have wondered more than once to-day how the founders would regard the history of this School which they established. More specifically, I have wondered what Channing

would think. It was at his house that the meeting of the Corporation was held, in the records of which the phrase "the Theological Seminary of the University" first appears. Seventy-five years ago last Monday he died. What would he think of our record? He might be disappointed with regard to the numbers of the School but if one should tell him that during the hundred years of its history this School had sent forth men of that sort that it has sent forth, — that to-day its faculty includes men of various denominational affiliations and habits of thought, — that its students are teaching in theological schools and colleges and preaching in pulpits of nearly all denominations, — that Andover is working here in harmonious coöperation with us, — that Episcopal, Baptist, and Methodist schools are also affiliated with us, I cannot imagine that Channing's heart would not leap with joy; that he would not give thanks to God, the Father, that the tree of his planting had borne such fruit.

Brethren, if those who founded this School, having the spirit that we know was in them, know what has been done in this School of their labor and sacrifice, we may be confident that their benediction is upon us to-night, and with that benediction, and with all the uplifting power it gives us, we look confidently and courageously into the future; hopefully determined, so far as our little work can go, to help bring in the time when men shall be

> One in the freedom of the truth,
> One in the joy of paths untrod,
> One in the soul's perennial youth,
> One in the larger thought of God.

PROFESSOR PEABODY

If that was not just the way Paul spoke at Thessalonica, then all my studies of this summer have been in vain.

The Divinity School is our Alma Mater, but the Society for Promoting Theological Education, — I use the term which Mr. Morison calls its abbreviated title, — is, if I may say so, a kind, rich, maiden aunt. She has lived on to be about a hundred years old, and she was fortunate enough to get a good fat legacy when she was about forty-five. Ever since that time she has been turning over the income to us. There are young men here who know very well what is meant by a Williams Fellowship. Some of the members of the Society for Promoting Theological Education have done us the kindness of coming here to-night; and I should like to give them in your name just a word of friendly counsel. There are other ways of assistance which would be very opportune for us here, and there is plenty of room for other bronze tablets by the side of that which commemorates Mr. John Davis Williams. Dr. Brown, who has just been elected to succeed our beloved friend, Dr. DeNormandie, as President of the Society, will no doubt take these counsels to heart, and will, I trust, assure us that the Society in its beneficient generosity will continue the expansion of the School.

REV. HOWARD N. BROWN

REPRESENTING THE SOCIETY FOR PROMOTING THEOLOGICAL EDUCATION

It seems rather plain that the men who formed the old Society which I have here the honor to represent, believed very earnestly in the study of theology; believed in such instruction as a necessary preparation for the Christian ministry; believed, I suppose, in the kind of preaching

which gave out again to the people at large something of the teaching thus received. Now that is a judgment which very strongly appeals to my own mind, though it is sometimes borne in upon me that in this I am not altogether on the popular side. A great many ministers even regard theology as about the last and least subject with which they have any concern. That view is, I take it, held by many educated people, and it seems to me entirely wrong. It is true that a great deal of the theological lore once imparted in schools of divinity is now quite out of date, but the same might be said of the science which belonged to the same period. The modern mind, however, appears to have concluded that this is a highly speculative and useless kind of study which does not really touch actual life. I take this judgment to be superficial and hasty. Nothing in all the world is more practical, and nothing touches the lives and conduct of men more closely than the ideas they cherish as to the character of the Divine Government under which we live, because there is where they find their sanctions and where their standards are formed for application to their own conduct. You cannot get far with any question of great social interest without finding religion at the bottom of the problem. None of the backward races and countries which we try to help can ever be brought forward very far until some one can give them a better religion. We ignore these things a great deal because with us sectarian differences are so bitter that it is extremely hard for us to enter into the public discussion of religious questions. The problem is always there, however, and it is about the biggest obstacle that we have to face. And whatever distinction we may make between religion and theology, religion never gets to be a social force apart from the theology which gives it definiteness and form. Ideas

need organization as much as men. We often speak of the wonderful organization of the Church of Rome. That observation ought not to be applied to its ecclesiastical methods alone; the mind of that church is a very exact and complete form of rationalistic construction. To meet that in the great forum of the world's debate there must be equal discipline and organization. The prophet is, after all, generally a voice as of one crying in the wilderness; and he is still too little regarded who brings that prophet's word into the common mind and consciousness of men. I am very proud to belong to a society which exists for the promotion of theological education. The Society sends you greetings on the completion of a hundred years of useful service. The men who founded this School might well feel gratified with its later history. I trust they know and are pleased with what it has accomplished. The School has always been a pioneer in spiritual territory not yet much cultivated, and now that the trail it has blazed is beginning to be filled with an increasing throng I think it has great promise of increasing usefulness.

PROFESSOR PEABODY

Those of us who lived in Cambridge and already had the privileges of the University felt that an enormous advantage would be gained by the Andover School in coming here and throwing its lot with us, and we were inclined to wonder why there was so much hesitation on their part. Yet when I look back upon that negotiation in the light of these years I see on the part of the School at Andover a very high degree of magnanimity, open-mindedness and generosity. It assumed absolute good faith on the part of the University; it assumed that the environment here was not to be hostile to the faith which the School represented; and still further

it assumed an absolute absence of competitive self-interest or sectarian distrust. All this looked plain enough down here, but from the height of Andover Hill it may well have caused some sense of scepticism or hesitation. What has happened since that time has brought a confirmation of our hopes; and now in these later days there have been added to our fraternal relations with Andover, the equally fraternal, though in some instances different relations with no less than three other Schools of Theology. Into this unity of the spirit which is the bond of peace we have all entered together; and President Fitch, representing these affiliated schools, will give us, I am sure, an inspiring and cordial greeting.

PRESIDENT FITCH

REPRESENTING THE AFFILIATED THEOLOGICAL SCHOOLS

Dr. Peabody, Alumni of the Harvard Divinity School, Brethren in the Christian Ministry: It was both very gratefully and gladly that I accepted the invitation to speak to-night on behalf of the other theological schools affiliated with the University, and to present for us all the heartiest felicitations to the Harvard Divinity School on the completion of one hundred years of honorable and distinguished service. And, unlike some honors that come to us, this is not only a very pleasant but a very easy task. During the last eight years, when both administrative and teaching duties have brought me into intimate contact with the Divinity School, I have learned how magnanimous, how scrupulously honest in instruction and honorable beyond all computation in spirit, the Harvard Divinity School is. So that we have come to feel at Andover that her joys are ours; and indeed there is no alumnus here to-night who is any prouder of the School than we, nor could

any one bring more joyous congratulations to its birthday. That 's why it is so easy and so pleasant to be speaking to you now; all the things I have to say are merely outward signs of a veritable, inward grace.

My connection with the Harvard Divinity School extends over a considerably longer period than any one here present appears to realize. I had the honor of being an alumnus of Harvard College a good many years before I became a teacher in Cambridge, and, long before I became even an alumnus, I had sat at the feet of the teachers of Divinity. For when I was a sophomore, I was fired with the ambition to understand the mediaeval papacy and I betook myself to Professor Emerton in October of 1897 and informed him that I wished to be allowed to take History 4. Mr. Emerton received me with no perceptible enthusiasm, and when he realized that, all discouragement to the contrary, I was determined to take his course, I observed an expression of deep melancholy stealing over his expressive countenance. But I succeeded in registering under him and, what is more remarkable, in passing his examination. So you see it was very many years ago that I received my first impression of the depth of learning and the austerity of method of the Harvard Divinity School!

And indeed there was another reason why I, like many another boy who has come up to Harvard College, learned to revere and admire this ancient school. I had been brought up under a minister who was not only a saint, but also a rigid Calvinist. All my life I had heard speculative and apologetic preaching, whose vocabulary and whose view of the world alike belonged to a previous generation. But when I came to Harvard College I gradually became interested in the Chapel exercises as they were conducted by the then Chairman of the Board of Preachers. The al-

most perfect technique of his daily talks, their simplicity of expression, ethical idealism, and religious insight, opened my eyes to the comprehensive message, the vitality, and grace of the Christian Gospel. And I owe with countless others, very much to Dr. Peabody and his interpretations of human experience in the light of a reasonable but vital Christian faith. So you see I look back to-night upon a good many years of interest in and admiration for this school.

And to-night all her friends are here to praise her. And since we are all friends, we need not say much of her chief glories in this company, for we all know what they are. She has scorned the specious arts of popularity; she has not worshipped the Book of Numbers. Quality of human material has seemed more important than an impressive roster of students; " few but fit " has been the motto over her doors. All this has cost something although it has been so well worth doing. High and exacting standards have been maintained here for a long time, long before they were popular in many places else, and there must have been many months and years of anxiety and even discouragement. We also honor the school because to both teacher and taught she has given the priceless gift of freedom. It has been the facts and all the facts and nothing but the facts in theological science which have been given in her class room. There is catholicity of spirit here, a rare and precious thing; and that integrity of the mind without which there can be no real integrity of conduct.

But these things are on all our lips to-night and I want to turn from them, in closing, to another notable service, not so easily recognized, of this school to our academic community. I doubt if the unreflective or casual observer ever realizes what Harvard College owes to the Divinity School.

I have come to believe, from personal contact with the undergraduate body, that there is no place where the Puritan tradition survives more clearly and effectively than in Harvard College; or few places where ethical values are so unconsciously but yet so universally accepted by the undergraduate body. After all, to the Harvard undergraduates, the supreme thing is character. Young men here have certain moral principles which are to them as absolute as the Categorical Imperative was to Kant. Character, as judged of course by their own and not their elders' standards, is precious in their eyes. Now it is an interesting thing, watching these youth of the college, to ask whence they derive that instinctive, pervasive, ethical standard. Its sources are manifestly complex and obscure, but I am convinced that a major one is found in the temper and spirit, throughout these many student generations, of this Harvard Divinity School. I believe the College has maintained its Puritan tradition with singular continuity through these many years, very largely because of the indirect and half-unconscious influence of the presence of a Theological Faculty in the University, the contribution of ethical and intellectual idealism which a group of scholars, possessed of integrity and spiritual insight, has made to our common life. I am sure that it has been valuable to the College, beyond all computation, to have absorbed those influences, which have been coming year by year from a group of men who were quietly but persistently teaching that the things of the spirit are forever enthroned above the affairs of secular or commercial life. Such teaching renders an immense service to the American democracy. It has made the contribution and value of this school to extend far beyond the roll of its immediate students or the bounds of its own locality. How gladly and gratefully then,

not only as a colleague in one of the affiliated Faculties, but as an alumnus of Harvard College, do I extend to the Divinity School our congratulations and good wishes upon this occasion.

PROFESSOR PEABODY

A distinguished leader of the higher education visited Boston a short time ago in the person of Sir William Peterson, Principal of McGill University in Montreal. It was suggested that I should bring him here to a little meeting on our Visitation Day, and, to my surprise, he stayed with us throughout that midday gathering. In the course of conversation he told me why on this visit to Boston he had taken such special pains to learn of the modest work of this School. He said that McGill University in Montreal had worked out a system of affiliation among various schools for the ministry which insured autonomy but utilized a common opportunity, and he remarked that the most efficient agent of this affiliated theological life was Professor Fraser of the Presbyterian College of Montreal. "Why," I said, "That is our Fraser! He is one of our boys!" He must, I thought, have learned among us here something of that spirit of coöperative scholarship, and of that absence of sectarian animosity which make him a fitting agent for a similar task in the great metropolis of that northern Empire. And now, with great graciousness and generosity, Professor Fraser comes to offer his testimony. He has recently been elevated to the position of Principal of his College, so that he comes to us, not only in a filial, but in an official capacity. I welcome him in your name.

PRINCIPAL D. J. FRASER

OF THE PRESBYTERIAN COLLEGE, MONTREAL

Mr. Chairman, President Lowell, and Brother Alumni: When the late A. B. Davidson was teaching Hebrew in New College, Edinburgh, the Semitic Chair in the United Presbyterian College not far away was vacant and the students were sent over to the Free Church College. Professor Davidson had a list of the students who were expected to recite in class, and as he called first on the members of his own college the "United Presbyterians" imagined that they were merely spectators, not participants, and became rather careless regarding their preparation for class. Unexpectedly, however, one morning, Dr. Davidson called on one of the "United Presbyterians" only to get the response "unprepared." He went down the list only to get the same response from half a dozen men — "Unprepared." Looking over the class with a twinkle in his eye, the professor said with his characteristic genial cynicism, "I always understood that 'U. P.' stood for 'United Presbyterian' but I now understand that it stands for 'Unprepared.'"

It is hardly necessary to say that as a "United Presbyterian" I am quite "unprepared" for the very gracious response you have given me here after my long absence. I have been much interested to-day in renewing my acquaintance with some of my old friends and in seeing the enlargement of the facilities at Harvard for Theological study. I visited my old room in the Divinity Hall and I found that it was occupied by a gentleman who, if one were to judge by his name and the books on his shelves, was evidently not preparing for such an unremunerative profession as that of the Presbyterian Ministry in Canada. I also peered

into the Dean's room and I had very tender recollections of Dean Everett of blessed memory. Although I did not take any work under him I have always retained a grateful memory of his simplicity and considerateness, of his calm contemplative outlook on life and of the quiet and helpful conversations which I frequently had with him in his office. I have been thinking very gratefully too of my old master, Joseph Henry Thayer, with whom I took a great deal of my work when I was here. It has been a special delight, Mr. Chairman, to meet you again who have always continued to take an interest in your former students and from whom I have from time to time received very gracious messages.

I bring you greetings to-night at their special request from the graduates in Canada, especially in Montreal.

Two recent graduates of the Harvard Divinity School are my colleagues. Professor W. A. Gifford who, I think, was among the first to take the Degree of Doctor of Theology, is doing excellent work in the department of Church History, and Professor Wm. C. Graham, who has taken his Master's Degree, occupies one of the Semitic Chairs. Recently he went overseas, as Chaplain to the 148th Battalion. I have just had an interesting letter from Captain Graham in which he envied me the opportunity of coming back to Harvard to renew old friendships.

I shall not take the time at this late hour to outline to you what our scheme of Theological Coöperation in the Montreal Colleges is. Suffice it to say that there are four Divinity Schools affiliated to McGill University, representing the Anglican, the Congregational, the Methodist and the Presbyterian communions. These four colleges really coöperate. Each college retains its own individuality, having its own professors appointed as heretofore and conferring its own

degrees; but there is cordial coöperation and I think that the scheme has safely passed the experimental stage. Last year out of 168 hours' instruction a week offered by the four colleges in the joint courses, only 13 hours were reserved for denominational instruction. In the college with which I have the honour to be connected, we reserve only one half course which deals with the "Rules and Forms of Procedure" of our own communion. We have been watching with deep interest the wonderful progress which you have made here, in your more comprehensive scheme of coöperation in theological study and research.

While I should not like to give the impression that the Church to which I belong, with its Scottish traditions, is not favourable to coöperation with other churches, while I think that the Presbyterian Church in Canada has a record of which any church might well be proud for comprehensive spirit and for toleration, at the same time I feel sure that any little contribution which I have been privileged to make to the coöperative scheme in Montreal has been made possible to a large extent by the atmosphere which I breathed during my stay at Harvard and by the method of study which I acquired here under my masters; and I am here to-night, Mr. Chairman, especially to extend an expression of my personal gratitude to you with whom, I think, next to Dr. Thayer, I took most of my work. The work which I did under Dr. Thayer is partly responsible for the position which I occupy to-day as a teacher of New Testament Criticism, and the work which I did with you in your class in Social Ethics and in your Seminar gave me the inspiration, and, I think, the method which have enabled me to do something towards guiding the forces of the Presbytery of Montreal during the last four or five years into the field of Social Service.

Many shall come from the North and from the South, and from the East and West and shall sit down together in the Kingdom. We have just heard this report from our brother from the North, and I now turn to a similar message from the distant State of Kentucky.

I am tempted to recall here a personal incident. When I was Dean of the School I received a letter from an unknown youth in another seminary saying that he had everything done for him there to make him contented, but that he would like to come to Harvard; and he opened the question of what we had to offer him in the way of studies, and presumably in the way of assistance. I was in the ambitious mood of a young administrative officer, characterized perhaps by what Mr. Fitch has called "austerity," and I wrote to this young man that if he was contented where he was, and was getting all he needed, I did n't think he should be encouraged to come to us. I advised him to stay where he was. But on the first day of the College term, as I was sitting in my study, I looked up from my chair and saw a young man standing by my side, who said, without any preamble, "Well, you see I am coming, anyhow." The incident verified an opinion which I have long held, that if you want to get a worthy student you should make it hard for him to get in. If he thinks you do not want him, he is apt to conclude that the school is exactly the place to which he wants to come. Well, that young man not only came at his own risk, but was promoted from position to position until he at last received our highest award and became a Williams Fellow. He did what I think it would take a pretty plucky young man to do, — he proceeded to apply for his doctorate in the Old Testament, under the paternal

direction of Professor G. F. Moore, and what is more, he got it. And now he is head of the Bible College of the Disciples of Christ in Lexington, Kentucky, and has come to tell us what he thinks of us.

DEAN H. L. CALHOUN

OF THE COLLEGE OF THE BIBLE, LEXINGTON, KENTUCKY

Friends and Fellow Alumni of the Harvard Divinity School: But one thing, a sense of duty to acknowledge the obligations resting upon me for the benefits received from the Harvard Divinity School, could have induced me to promise to speak this evening. When I look around this board, and see gathered here the sons of Harvard of riper years, and of far greater attainment, and more splendid achievement than any of us young men dare claim, it seems to me the height of rashness for one so young to venture to speak in this presence. But surely even the youngest child should be permitted to express his affection for his mother; surely the older sons will listen with patience to a younger son as he declares his love for the common Mother of us all, in harmony with that beautiful spirit of liberty, freedom, and tolerance so characteristic of the Harvard Divinity School.

I was granted the liberty of selecting my own subject. Therefore I have chosen this, "Benefits derived from attending Harvard Divinity School." I take it that when I speak of the benefits derived from attending this School, that while derived by one alumnus, you will understand that these same benefits are likely to be conferred upon others; that this one whom I have in mind is but a type of many who have preceded him, and of many who will follow him in attending the same School. Perhaps just a glance at this particular beneficiary when he first came to

Harvard would not be out of place. Picture to yourselves a man, well past thirty years of age, with a wife and three small children, poor in purse, far richer than he needed to be in self-assurance, a strict Trinitarian and a straight conservative, affiliated with a communion almost unknown in New England, outspoken and ardent in the declaration of those views, which differentiated him from many others, and you will have a fairly correct representation of the *raw* material.

There were benefits conferred; benefits which I am happy this evening to acknowledge; material benefits, and others less material, but perhaps more important, that, upon one so poor in purse as this particular beneficiary, were as manna from Heaven. In his first year a Hopkins Scholarship was no small matter to him, and the fact that that year, through the wise management of the Treasurer having charge of those funds, the Hopkins Scholarship paid $301.10, contributed very largely to the comfort of the family of this particular beneficiary. Of course, the larger sum from the Williams Fellowship carrying with it the encouragement that it gave, was even a greater material benefit, for the following year. (Will you pardon me for mentioning a very personal episode of the man who was then serving as Dean. Little things sometimes make lasting impressions especially along the line of friendship.) The first year that this alumnus was in Harvard was the year of the great anthracite coal strike and famine, when the price of coal soared far above the normal, and when many people could not secure sufficient fuel at any price. One crisp winter morning in the very midst of this famine, this beneficiary, upon answering his own doorbell, found the Dean of the Harvard Divinity School standing on his front portico, who solicitously inquired as to whether or not this alumnus had fuel enough

for the comfort of his family, and he generously suggested that if there was any lack, a coal cart sent to his own cellar, which had been wisely and well filled in the preceding summer, would secure whatever was needed at whatever price the student wished to pay. While the student never found it necessary to accept this gracious and kind offer, the memory of the fact that the offer *was made* has remained with him as one of the sweetest recollections in connection with his stay in Harvard. And he believes that it has helped him to appreciate the declaration of that One, who said, " even a cup of cold water given in His name should not lose its reward." But there were other benefits in which we are more particularly interested, the moral and religious. May I mention first among them, that this particular alumnus was made to feel perfectly at home, free to do his own thinking in his own peculiar way. He was given a most cordial and hearty welcome by his fellow students, and by the members of the Faculty. And even his peculiar views, and he *had* peculiar views, were treated with the utmost consideration. The *new* views, and they *were* new to him, many of them, were most kindly and considerately offered. Again he was left perfectly free to accept or reject those views just as he pleased. He was not even asked whether he accepted any of these views or whether he even had any views to accept. Not only this, but he was never, at any time, pressed to acknowledge the debt of obligation being conferred upon him. All these benefits were bestowed in the splendid spirit of, " Let not your left hand know what your right hand does."

Certain results were bound to follow. In the first place this particular alumnus learned to love the Harvard Divinity School. He learned to admire it, and to admire it for its own personal self, apart from that splendid spirit, the spirit

of service, which says, "Let us do all the good we can, to all the people we can, at all the times we can, in all the ways we can, and just as long as we can." As another result that came from this stay in Harvard, this alumnus became more generous in his feelings to those who differed from him in religion. He learned to love the Harvard Divinity School because the Harvard Divinity School first loved him. He learned to be more charitable toward those who differed from him, because the Harvard Divinity School had first been generous, most generous, toward him.

He is glad to acknowledge, to-night, that he believes that whatever humble part he may have in shaping the lives and future plans of the students in the College of which he has the honor to be Dean, a good part will come from that spirit of love, that broad spirit of catholicity, that he learned as one of the most splendid characteristics of the Harvard Divinity School. Another result has been this: it has been his pride and earnest care to see to it that, not one year since he went away from the Harvard Divinity School, has his own School been without its representative here.

Again, when he came to Harvard he was set to thinking about certain great questions, and in thinking about these questions he has found employment profitable to himself, and, he trusts, not without benefit to some others associated with him. May I mention a few of these subjects? First: does it really matter whether Jesus is Divine Human or Human Divine, just so he is Divine? Does it really matter whether the Bible be miraculously inspired or naturally inspired, just so it is inspired? Does it really matter whether the teaching of that Bible be conceived of as absolutely perfect or only materially so, just so it is materially so? Does it really matter whether religion be conceived of as statically complete or progressively complete, just so it

is complete? Does it really matter whether the Church be conceived of as an institution whose chief function is to prepare men for the life to come or for the life that now is, provided that the course of preparation be just the same? Does it really matter if men do differ about theological questions if their characters are equally good, just so they *are* equally good? Is it not true that there is so much of knowledge in the most ignorant of us, and so much of ignorance in the most learned of us, that it really becomes each one of us to be kind and considerate to all the others of us? In closing may he propose this as a sentiment worthy to be cherished by every alumnus with regard to his Alma Mater:

Ever honored be her Memory,
Ever loyal be her Sons,
Ever prosperous be her Future.

PROFESSOR PEABODY

Our next speaker is now directing, as President of the Meadville Theological School, the activities of an efficient and growing work. I welcome our brother and friend, President Southworth.

PRESIDENT F. C. SOUTHWORTH

OF MEADVILLE THEOLOGICAL SCHOOL

It has been a peculiar pleasure to sit at this board tonight, to return in person as I often return in thought to the scenes of some of the most highly cherished and most significant experiences of my life; and to be associated again, for a little while, with those to whom similar experiences have come. I am conscious, however, that I am asked to stand in this conspicuous place, not simply as an alumnus of now about twenty-five years' standing, but chiefly as the representative of a School which owes more to the Har-

vard Divinity School than it has ever acknowledged, and more than it can possibly repay. The Harvard Divinity School had not been in existence more than a quarter of a century when a young man from Western Pennsylvania, Frederic Huidekoper by name, appeared at Divinity Hall and was duly enrolled as a student. Though he was prevented by precarious health from finishing his course, he seems, during his brief term of residence, to have seen a vision of what a true school of the prophets should be. And so when he stood once more upon his native heath, he asked himself if he might not aid in establishing in the then remote region where he lived an institution which should do for the young men of the Central West what Harvard was doing for the young men of the East. This vision, by the help of his father, an immigrant from Holland with the real pioneer spirit, quickly assumed visible form; and within less than a year of the time of his return from Harvard the Meadville Theological School was opened. The first year there were ten students, and in the course of a few years there appeared upon an adjacent hilltop a building known as Divinity Hall, recalling in its lines some of the features of the building with which you are familiar. That was more than sixty years ago; and even at that time graduates of the School were scattered throughout the country, occupying positions of influence and responsibility.

From that time the relation between that School and this has continued intimate. The first President of Meadville was an alumnus of this institution; so also the second, and the third. The fourth, though not an alumnus of the Divinity School, was a graduate of the College. The fifth, in selecting a School of Divinity, followed the example of his predecessors; and that is as many presidents as Meadville has had thus far. So also with the Meadville professors.

A goodly proportion have been trained wholly or in part in this institution. Indeed, there was a time when theological learning seems to have been at low ebb in Massachusetts, when the Harvard Divinity School reached six hundred miles across the country in search of a professor, and carried off the then President of Meadville, Oliver Stearns, who subsequently became the Dean of this School. And then, some twenty-five years later, Meadville returned the compliment by inviting a young man who had been giving instruction in the New Testamant here to join the Meadville Faculty, where he is now the revered James Freeman Clarke Professor of Church History.

But the School at Meadville has not only taken its teachers from your Alumni, and borrowed the shape of one of its buildings; it has also done what is vastly more significant. At its very outset it wrote into its Constitution the same Charter of Freedom under which you have been operating during these hundred years; not in identity of language, but in the same spirit. Fourteen years ago I sat in yonder chapel and heard a notable paper by Professor George Foot Moore on "An Undenominational School of Theology." Only one sentence of that address should I have liked to see modified. The speaker was telling about the limitations of the denominational school of theology and said, if I remember rightly, that in every denominational school of theology there was some criterion either vague or definite, of what a man may believe and teach other than his own conviction of the truth. From that sweeping indictment I think Meadville may properly be omitted. If it were to apply any criterion of what a man shall believe and teach, other than his own conviction of what is true, it would be false to the very principles upon which the School is founded, and would forfeit the respect of the churches to which it looks for support.

Professor Peabody has graciously referred to Meadville as either a daughter or a sister institution. I think in view of what I have said about the origin of the School that Meadville may properly be called a legitimate child of the Harvard Divinity School. And if that is true, then in addition to the goodly company of men who look to Harvard as their foster-mother, there is another company of those who are serving the world faithfully and well in the ministry of religion who may look to her as their foster-grandmother.

It has been a rare, but highly valued, privilege that I have sometimes enjoyed to be present at a Harvard Commencement, and to see the great throng of young men and old men who owe allegiance to Harvard and delight to acknowledge it, returning to the College from various parts of the world. In the presence of such a goodly company I have asked myself what, in reality, is Harvard ? And the thought has come to me that it is not a company of undergraduates, it is not a group of buildings, it is not a Board of Overseers or a Corporation or even a Faculty. Harvard, after all, is the sum total of the sons of Harvard who have gone out from her doors to carry her discipline and her ideals to the four corners of the earth. And wherever these sons have gone, whether among the lonely fishermen of Labrador, or into the trenches of France and hospitals of Serbia, there it is that the Institution is at work. And so, as I have sat here tonight, looking into the faces of my fellow-alumni, I have realized, and I would like to speak of it for the satisfaction it may bring those who are teaching here, that the Harvard Divinity School is something more than the company of students who resort from time to time to its class rooms. It is that larger company of men whom the School has sent out into the world, fighting the battle of truth against error and right against wrong,

and seeking to transform the kingdoms of this world into the kingdom of God.

I had the privilege of taking part as an undergraduate in the celebration of the two hundred and fiftieth anniversary of Harvard, and of hearing among other memorable words the inspiring poem by Dr. Holmes. Those of you who are old enough to have been there will remember, at least, these lines.

> As once of old from Ida's lofty height
> The flaming signal flashed across the night,
> So Harvard's beacon sends its unspent rays
> Till every watch-tower kindles in the blaze.

What he went on to say of the College with the poet's imagination and the poet's fire, might be said to-night in all truth and soberness of this School. During its hundred years of glorious history its light has been shining, and its radiance has been seen from afar. It shines to-night not only for Harvard but also for Meadville and for the group of schools which are represented in this company. It is shining in the hearts of those who are carrying the visions and the discipline of their student days out into the highways and byways of the world. And we whose high privilege it was as students of this School to see that light, pledge ourselves that so far as in us lies we will keep it burning that it may shine with increasing brightness during the centuries which are to come.

PROFESSOR PEABODY

Many people still fancy the minister to be of an anaemic, sentimental, cloistered type; a recluse who speaks a language not of the present age, and who emerges from the solitude of his study to offer himself for an incompetent service of the modern world. But if you should go to Cleve-

land, Ohio, that wonderful metropolis of civic and political progress, you would find at the center of almost every enterprise of social reform, civic endeavor, and philanthropic organization, the virile, modern, wide-awake, leadership of the minister of one inconspicuous church. The last time I saw that man was at the Yale Ball Game of last June. He was attired in what one might call the costume of a harlequin. He was at the head of his Class, marching to the field and I don't know now whether he would rather be introduced with the dignity of a preacher to the University, or as the President of the Associated Harvard Clubs. At the moment I saw him he was engaged in that grotesque and acrobatic enterprise, known as leading the cheering. He approached me to speak, bathed in sweat, and I supposed that I was about to hear a hearty, " How do you do," but instead I heard in a hoarse whisper, " I have n't got any voice." I hope he is in better voice tonight.

REV. MINOT SIMONS

OF CLEVELAND, OHIO

The program to-night has presented an array of University Professors, Presidents of Universities, Presidents of Theological Schools, and now it comes to a very ordinary minister. I feel, on this program, rather like Exhibit A for the School.

We have heard to-day that the School was founded to make ministers. That being the case *ministers* are its *products*, and *teachers* its *by-products*. Speaking as one of the products, I have asked myself what I could say of the School as I found it twenty-five years ago this month. I found in the School and in its teaching a spiritual earnestness which I knew could not be surpassed; a scholarship which was profoundly respected; the influence of a remarkable group of personalities which I have taken away as a

permanent equipment in my own spiritual life. I found here an openmindedness to the truth which, as a Harvard man, I prized. A modern critic has said, "We desperately need in our day a passion for reality, a passion for what is true and universal in things divine." This is absolutely true. The scholar has it, whatever his field; the scientist has it; WHY NOT THE CHURCH? Why is it that so many candid minds feel that the church is not dealing directly with realities? Is it not because it appeals so frequently, not to truth, but to tradition, not to what is fundamental and universal but to what is temporal and sectarian?

I found such passion for reality the chief incentive of the School. It is the incentive of the School now, and makes it of vast importance in training ministers for the world to which they must now minister.

I felt absolutely no sectarian pressure. Some of you can see Dean Everett, as I can, looking down upon his class, and hear him say, "My neighbor tells me that if I will unite with his church I shall find God. I may, indeed, find God in that way, but somehow my neighbor reminds me of the little boy who sold tickets to his mother's yard to view the eclipse." Then he would look down and say, "Those who entered may be said to have received their money's worth; they saw what they had paid to see."

Just one final word from my heart to yours. The Divine Plan, as I apprehend it, is the spiritual mastery of life. That thought is my own spiritual guide. It is the inspiration of my ministry. It is the goal of my own individual effort, and what I see to be the goal of the human race. I feel that the Harvard Divinity School has all the glory and dignity of a place in the fulfilling of that plan. It is a vital force in civilization and in human progress. It is in a position to minister to truth seekers. No man has ever come

out from its influence without the profound conviction that the truthseeker is the Godseeker. And I know of no other conviction that with consecration and patience, faith and hope, can contribute more to the spiritual mastery of life.

PROFESSOR PEABODY

And now, Brethren, we come to our final word, which will be spoken to us by one of the most alert and invigorating, and I had almost said, youngest friends of the School. Whether President Lowell, at the beginning of his administration, conceived with distinctness the new ways of opportunity that have opened before us in theological education, I do not know; but this all know who have been concerned with him as teachers, that with each new year his inventive, keen, and vigorous mind has seized more and more eagerly on this new problem and that the future of theological education in the University and its affiliated schools is to be permanently secure in his efficient and active hands.

President Lowell spoke briefly to the alumni, after which Professor Peabody dismissed the assembly with the following words:

And now, brethren, let me simply, in your name, thank these guests who have come to address you, some of them from great distances, but all united in the common loyalty of faith; and in the name of those of us who are resident here, let me thank this large and cordial assemblage here for its gracious presence. With high hopes for a large future, and with a fraternal and affectionate grasp of each other's hands, we say good night.

POSTSCRIPT

PRINCIPAL FRASER of the Presbyterian College of Montreal preached in Appleton Chapel on October 8th, the Sunday following the one hundredth anniversary of the Divinity School, to which he referred as follows in the course of his sermon:

"We have just been celebrating the One Hundredth Anniversary of the Harvard Divinity School as distinct from the College, and we have been recalling the romantic story of its journey down through the maze of New England theological controversies. And what is the secret of its life — not its mere existence — but of its life more and more abundant. Why has the Divinity School in this University grown from such humble beginnings until it has become almost the unique centre of theological teaching and research, and is to-day in a position to welcome its graduates, representing all forms of church organization and all types of traditional beliefs, who have come from many parts of this continent do to reverence to their *Alma Mater*? Why? because it 'loved not the world which passeth away.' It refused to attach itself to local and temporal phases of religious thought. It ever resisted the temptation to become sectarian. It never allowed itself to be identified with little systems of theology that have their day and cease to be. During these hundred years it has stood consistently, in the face of many temptations, for spiritual ideals and moral methods, the unbiassed investigation of Christian truth, the honest facing of the facts of religious experience which are universal and eternal, the application to theological study of scientific standards, never lowered to meet the conveniences or necessities of denomination or creed. Therefore, amidst the rejoicings of its grateful and affectionate alumni who

have learned within its walls the freedom wherewith Christ, who is truth, makes us free, it has entered upon a new century with every promise of increasing usefulness and with a guarantee that men of most varied ecclesiastical types will continue to respond to its witness to the truth which is spiritual and eternal. The secret of its immortality is its ideal at least to do the will of God which abideth forever."

337342

PB-07931
5-49
C

BV
4070
H465
1916

Harvard University. *Divinity school.*

Addresses delivered at the observance of the 100th anniversary of the establishment of the Harvard divinity school, Cambridge, Massachusetts, October 5, 1916. Cambridge, Harvard university, 1917.

104 p. 21cm.

1. Harvard University. Divinity school--Anniversaries.

CCSC/ej

337342

PERMA-BOUND